ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Banca Patrimoni Sella & C. S.p.A v. Domain Admin
Case No. D2026-0438

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Banca Patrimoni Sella & C. S.p.A, Italy, represented by Studio Barbero S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is Domain Admin, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

he disputed domain name <sellapatrimoni.com> (the "Disputed Domain Name") is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 3, 2026. On February 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On February 4, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Disputed Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy Purposes, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 6, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on February 6, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Policy" or "UDRP"), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Supplemental Rules").

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 2, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 3, 2026.

The Center appointed Marilena Comanescu as the sole panelist in this matter on March 16, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant, Banca Patrimoni Sella & C. S.p.A. was founded in 2005 and belongs to Gruppo Sella, being specialized in asset management and administration of institutional and private clients. The first entity of the Gruppo Sella was founded in 1886 by Gaudenzio Sella, with his six brothers and cousins, which formed the Gaudenzio Sella & C. bank, a credit institution on which the Grouppo Sella is still based. Currently the Grouppo Sella is present in six countries with over 300 branches, and in 2023, its revenue was over EUR 700 million with an income of over EUR 150 million.

The Complainant owns trademark rights for or including “Patrimoni Sella” terms, such as the following:

- the Italian Trademark registration number 202020000057196 for BPS BANCA PATRIMONI SELLA C. (word), filed on July 13, 2020, registered on October 30, 2020, covering goods and services in International classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 41, and 42;

- the European Union Trademark registration number 006921522 for BANCA PATRIMONI SELLA & C. (word), filed on May 19, 2008, registered on February 2, 2009, covering goods and services in International classes 9, 35, and 36; and

- the European Union Trademark application number 019272339 for SELLA PATRIMONI (word), filed on November 6, 2025, covering goods and services in International classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 41, and 42.

The Complainant, and its affiliates, holds domain name encompassing the terms “patrimoni” and “sella” such as <patrimonisella.info> registered on August 31, 2024, and <bancapatrimonisella.it> registered on January 17, 2024.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on November 7, 2025, and, at the time of filing the Complaint, it was redirected to a website where the Disputed Domain Name was offered for sale for the amount of USD 1,888.

On December 3, 2025, the Complainant’s representative sent a Cease-and-Desist letter to the Respondent via the Registrar’s online contact form, followed by several reminders. No response was received.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

Notably, the Complainant contends the following:

- the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks, as it entirely reproduces the two most distinctive elements of the Complainant’s trademarks, namely the terms “Sella” and “Patrimoni”. Indeed, it should be noted that the term “Sella” corresponds to the surname of the Complainant’s founders and is highly distinctive for financial services, and that the term “patrimoni” means “assets” in Italian and is descriptive of services offered by the Complainant under its marks in the financial sector;

- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name mainly because: (i) is not a licensee, an authorized agent of the Complainant nor, in any other way, authorized to use the Complainant's marks; (ii) there is no evidence demonstrating that the Respondent might be commonly known by a name corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name as an individual, business, or other organization, and the Respondent has not provided the Complainant with any evidence of its use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services before any notice of the dispute; (iii) the composition of the Disputed Domain Name carries a risk of implied affiliation that cannot constitute fair use as it creates the impression that the Disputed Domain Name is owned by the Complainant, or related, linked to, or affiliated with the Complainant; and

- the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith mainly because: (i) the Disputed Domain Name is clearly referrable only to the Complainant considering the distinctiveness of the term "Sella", which corresponds to the surname of the Complainant's founders, and the meaning of the Italian word "patrimoni", i.e. "assets", which is descriptive of the Complainant's business, such circumstance is also confirmed by the searches for "sella patrimoni" on Google search engine; (ii) the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name only one day after the Complainant filed its trademark application for SELLA PATRIMONI with the European Union Intellectual Property Office. The timing of the registration of the Disputed Domain Name further evidences the Respondent's knowledge of the Complainant and its trademarks; (iii) the Disputed Domain Name has been directed since its registration to a website where it has been offered for sale for an amount of USD 1,888, and this fact makes it clear that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith, being aware of the Complainant and its trademarks – both registered and applied for -, in order to attempt to derive an illegitimate profit from the sale of the Disputed Domain Name to the Complainant for an amount exceeding the out-of-pocket costs directly related to the Disputed Domain Name; and (iv) the Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's Cease-and-Desist letter and reminders sent before initiating the present proceedings.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove on the balance of probabilities that:

(i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name; and
(iii) the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the Disputed Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's marks for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

While the slight alteration of the Complainant's registered trademarks, the removal of terms "banca", "bps", "c", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the deletion of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.9.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of "proving a negative", requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel notes the composition of the Disputed Domain Name which reproduces the dominant elements of the Complainant's registered trademarks and is identical to the Complainant's pending trademark (filed one day before the registration of the Disputed Domain Name). Further, the Disputed Domain Name was offered for public sale. These facts, together with the other circumstances in this case, including a lack of any explanation for the choice of Disputed Domain Name by the Respondent, do not amount to a bona fide offering or legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular but without limitation, that if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Disputed Domain Name was registered in bad faith, with knowledge of the Complainant and its trademarks particularly since it incorporates the Complainant's distinctive mark (registered since at least 2008) and is identical to the Complainant's pending trademark, filed one day before the registration of the Disputed Domain Name.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

Paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy provides the circumstance when the respondent has registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the disputed domain name to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name. The Panel finds that, registering a domain name confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark and offering it for sale to the public at large, for valuable consideration in excess of its out of-pocket expenses (absent any evidence from the Respondent to the contrary), preventing the Complainant from reflecting its trademark in a corresponding domain name, is evidence of bad faith behavior in the circumstances of this case. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.1.

Further, the Respondent failed to provide a response to the present procedures and to the Complainant's cease and desist letter. Along with other circumstances in this case, such facts constitute further evidence of bad faith.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the Disputed Domain Name, <sellapatrimoni.com>, be transferred to the Complainant.

/Marilena Comanescu/
Marilena Comanescu
Sole Panelist
Date: March 19, 2026