

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fendi S.r.l. v. Mr. Jacob Miller

Case No. D2026-0576

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Fendi S.r.l., Italy, represented by Studio Barbero S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is Mr. Jacob Miller, United States of America ("United States").

2. Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <fendiagency.com>, <fendi-global.com>, <fendi-hiring.com>, <fendi-jobs.com>, <fendi-recruitment.com>, and <fendi-team.com> are registered with CloudFlare, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 11, 2026. On February 12, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On February 13, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 19, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Rodrigo Velasco Santelices as the sole panelist in this matter on March 26, 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 is the Italian fashion house Fendi S.r.l., that in 2001 became part of the multinational luxury goods conglomerate LVMH Moët Hennessy Louis Vuitton SE, known as LVMH.

The origin of the Complainant dates to a hundred years, when a family-run fur and leather shop was opened by Adele and Edoardo Fendi on Via del Plebiscito, Rome, Italy in 1925.

The FENDI trademark was used by the Complainant or its predecessor in title for 100 years in connection with products of the high-fashion and leather industry, including ready-to-wear clothes, handbags, small leather goods, luggage, shoes, jewelry, eyewear, fragrances and home furniture. Today, FENDI products are commercialized in many countries with more than 270 stores in different locations worldwide.

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registrations for FENDI (among others):

- International Trademark Registration No. 426761 for FENDI (word mark) of December 1, 1976, in Classes 3, 18, 24, and 25;
- International Trademark Registration No. 483395 for FENDI (word mark) of March 22, 1984, in Class 9, designating, amongst others, United States;
- International Trademark Registration No. 483514 for FENDI (word mark) of March 26, 1984, in Class 16;
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 003500535 FENDI (word mark), filed on October 31, 2003, and registered on May 27, 2005, in Classes 3, 9, 14, 18, and 25;
- International Trademark Registration No. 487080 FENDI (figurative mark) of August 13, 1984, in Classes 3 and 5;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 1244466 FENDI (word mark), filed on October 29, 1976, and registered on July 5, 1983, in International Classes 18 and 25.

In order to further protect its trademarks also on the Internet, the Complainant has registered over 320 domain names worldwide consisting of or comprising the word FENDI including the most relevant one <fendi.com>, which was registered on December 26, 1995.

This Complaint concerns the following disputed domain names, with quite recent registration dates, as identified below:

<fendi-jobs.com>, registered on December 9, 2025;
<fendi-recruitment.com>, registered on December 9, 2025;
<fendi-team.com>, registered on December 9, 2025;
<fendi-global.com>, registered on December 10, 2025;
<fendi-hiring.com>, registered on December 10, 2025; and
<fendiagency.com>, registered on January 7, 2026.

All the disputed domain names have been directed since their registration to inactive websites, as evidenced by screenshots attached as Annex 8 of the Complaint. Furthermore, the disputed domain names <fendi-hiring.com>, and <fendiagency.com> have been used for sending fraudulent email in relation to the purported career opportunities at the Complainant.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that it is the owner of the registered trademark FENDI, so it cannot be questioned that all the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark since the disputed domain names reproduce the FENDI trademark in its entirety, followed by descriptive terms. For reasons set out above, and pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Complainant has strong rights in the well-known FENDI Trademark, and the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to it.

Thus, the Complainant further states that the Respondent clearly had the Complainant's trademark in mind when registering the disputed domain names in order to exploit and profit from its trademark rights. The disputed domain names were registered and being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similarity

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 names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here "jobs", "recruitment", "team", "global", "hiring", and "agency", may bear in assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent the finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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 that 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 with the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

The Respondent is not a licensee, authorized agent of the Complainant or in any other way authorized to use the Complainant's trademark FENDI. Specifically, it is well-established that typically in the absence of any license or permission from a Complainant to use the Complainant's trademarks, no bona fide or legitimate use of the domain name could reasonably be claimed.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The disputed domain names -since their registration- have not been pointed to any active website.

Moreover, the disputed domain names <fendi-hiring.com> and <fendiagency.com> have been used for fraudulent purposes. Together with email addresses "[...]"@fendi-hiring.com", and "[...]"@fendiagency.com", the Respondent has dispatched fraudulent communications promoting unauthorized careers opportunities at the Complainant, where the recipients were invited to provide their personal data in order to schedule a call.

Such willful conduct clearly demonstrates that Respondent never intended to use the Domain Names in connection with any legitimate purpose. Respondent's use of the Domain Names <fendi-hiring.com> and <fendiagency.com> to create email addresses incorporating the FENDI trademark which have been used in the context of a job scam campaign is part of a fraud scheme to trick recipients into believing that they are dealing with Complainant and induce them to provide their personal information.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed as applicable to this case: passing off, phishing, or other types of fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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 Complainant's trademark FENDI was registered several years prior to the registration of the disputed domain names. Further, the Complainant's trademark FENDI is well known internationally. Therefore, the Respondent knew or should have known the Complainant's trademark when registering the disputed domain names. The Panel finds that this fact cannot be a simple coincidence.

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.

As regards the disputed domain names <fendi-hiring.com> and <fendiagency.com>, which have been used for sending fraudulent emails, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, or endorsement of the disputed domain names, in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed passing off, and phishing, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

The disputed domain names <fendi-global.com>, <fendi-jobs.com>, <fendi-recruitment.com>, and <fendi-team.com> do not resolve to any website. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. On the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain names, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names <fendi-global.com>, <fendi-jobs.com>, <fendi-recruitment.com>, and <fendi-team.com> does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith, and 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 names <fendiagency.com>, <fendi-global.com>, <fendi-hiring.com>, <fendi-jobs.com>, <fendi-recruitment.com>, and <fendi-team.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Rodrigo Velasco Santelices/

Rodrigo Velasco Santelices

Sole Panelist

Date: April 8, 2026