

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bugatti International S.A. v. Gaston Lauge, Miami Residential Group Inc
Case No. D2026-0984

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Bugatti International S.A., Luxembourg, represented by UNIT4 IP Rechtsanwälte, Stolz Stelzenmüller Weiser Grohmann Partnerschaft mbB Rechtsanwälte, Germany.

The Respondent is Gaston Lauge, Miami Residential Group Inc, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bugattiresidences.miami> (the "Disputed Domain Name") is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 6, 2026. On March 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On March 9, 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 (Registration Private, The RDAP server redacted the value) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 10, 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 March 13, 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 March 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 5, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Marilena Comanescu as the sole panelist in this matter on April 14, 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 a manufacturer of luxury sports cars with its principal office in Luxembourg. The Complainant has been active since the beginning of the 20th century and currently sells its vehicles worldwide. The Complainant and its partners also offer accessories (apparel, watches, collectibles etc.), as well as luxury apartments known as “Bugatti Residences”.

The Complainant holds trademark rights for BUGATTI worldwide, such as the following:

- the European Union Trademark Registration number 001394154 for BUGATTI (word), filed on November 23, 1999, registered on February 16, 2001, covering goods and services in International Classes 3, 4, 6, 8, 12, 14, 16, 24, 28, and 30;
- the European Union Trademark Registration number 005083258 for BUGATTI (word), filed on May 18, 2006, registered on December 23, 2008, covering goods and services in International Classes from 1 to 45; and
- the International Trademark Registration number 553246 for BUGATTI (word), registered on April 12, 1990, protected in many jurisdictions worldwide including in the United States, and covering goods in International Classes 3, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 24, 25, 28, 33, and 34.

This well-known character of the Complainant’s BUGATTI trademark has been confirmed by earlier UDRP panels, see *Bugatti International S.A. v. Nesim Argun*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-2028](#) and cases cited therein.

The Complainant owns domain names incorporating the mark BUGATTI, such as <bugatti.com>, <bugatti.store>, and <bugattiresidences.com>.

The Disputed Domain Name <bugattiresidences.miami> was registered on September 7, 2025 and it at one time resolved to a parking page stating: “BUGATTI RESIDENCES BRICKELL MIAMI IS COMING SOON”. At the time of filing the Complaint, it redirected to another parking website which also displayed a button “Get This Domain”.

The Respondent appears to be a real estate broker in the United States.

According to Annex 8 to the amended Complaint, before commencing the present procedures, the Complainant became aware that the Respondent was using the trademark BUGATTI in connection with online advertising on the Respondent’s own website. Therefore, on March 6, 2026, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent to put it on notice with regard to its trademark rights. The Respondent reacted on the same day apologizing for the inconvenience caused and confirming that the infringing website has been taken down. However, the Respondent has never disclosed that they also own the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant has become aware that the Respondent owns the Disputed Domain Name after the Center’s notification following the Registrar verification.

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 that:

- the trademark and trade name BUGATTI are world-famous and enjoy a reputation of highest quality, performance and excellence;
- the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the BUGATTI trademark since it incorporates it in its entirety with the addition of the purely descriptive term “residences”, whereas there are official “Bugatti Residences”, which are available only in Dubai so far. Therefore, the use of such descriptive element reinforces the association with the Complainant and creates the false impression that the Disputed Domain Name is an official website of the Complainant;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name, the Complainant has never authorised or licensed the Respondent to use the BUGATTI trademark or any domain name incorporating it, there is not and never has been a business relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent, the Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name;
- the Respondent has registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith in particular because:
 - (i) the BUGATTI trademark has the status of a well-known and reputed trademark with a substantial and widespread reputation across the world, has a strong commercial presence on the Internet and a strong media presence and was registered decades before the registration of the Disputed Domain Name; (ii) the Disputed Domain Name suggests that it is connected to the Complainant and to the “Bugatti Residences” project. However, the Complainant has never authorized such use of its trademarks by the Respondent and there is no connection between the Respondent and the Complainant whatsoever, and therefore the Respondent apparently attempts to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s famous mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the Disputed Domain Name /website; (iii) the Disputed Domain Name redirects to a parking website and is offered for sale. This underlines the Respondent’s bad faith and that the Disputed Domain Name has been registered only for commercial gain; (iv) the Respondent employed a privacy service to hide its identity; (v) the registration of the Disputed Domain Name by the Respondent prevents the Complainant from reflecting its BUGATTI and/or “Bugatti Residence” trademark in a corresponding domain name and thus limits the Complainant’s trademark rights; and (vi) as the Disputed Domain Name is “parked” and not actively used for an actual website, the Respondent is also engaged in bad faith passive holding.

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. See 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 mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of other terms, here “residences”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such element 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 1.8.

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 the 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 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 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 Respondent is not a licensee or a business partner of the Complainant. The Disputed Domain Name at one time was used for a parking page promoting “Bugatti Residences”. According to the evidence provided in the Complaint, before filing the Complaint, the Respondent has used the Complainant’s BUGATTI trademark on its own website to advertise its services. After being put on notice by the Complainant, the Respondent took such infringing website down immediately. However, the registration of the Disputed Domain Name was not disclosed to the Complainant at that stage. The Disputed Domain Name later on redirects to a different parking page which also displays a button “Get This Domain”. Such use does not satisfy a bona fide offering of goods or services under the Policy.

Also, the composition of the Disputed Domain Name carries a risk of implied affiliation, being very similar to the Complainant’s mark (comprising the BUGATTI mark together with the dictionary term “residences”), and being highly similar to the Complainant’s domain name <bugattiresidences.com>. UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

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 Disputed Domain Name was registered in bad faith, with knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark particularly since it reproduces the Complainant's mark, which is famous worldwide and was registered decades before the Disputed Domain Name was created. Also, the additional dictionary term, "residences" in the Disputed Domain Name, increases the association with the Complainant because the Complainant also provides goods and services under the name "Bugatti Residences". Further on, the Disputed Domain Name is highly similar to the Complainant's domain name <bugattiresidences.com>.

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.

Before the filing of the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name at one time resolved to a landing page stating: "BUGATTI RESIDENCES BRICKELL MIAMI IS COMING SOON". UDRP panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. The Panel notes the distinctiveness and international reputation of the Complainant's trademark; the composition of the Disputed Domain Name together with the banner posted on the landing page; the Respondent's failure to provide a response in this procedure; and the previous correspondence between the Parties in relation to another domain name and the associated website displaying the Complainant's trademark, and finds that, in the circumstances of this case, the passive holding of the Disputed Domain Name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

The Disputed Domain Name later on redirects to another parking website which also displays a button "Get This Domain". The change of the use of the Disputed Domain Name does not affect the Panel's finding of the Respondent's bad faith.

Previous UDRP panels have found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a widely known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can, by itself, create a presumption of bad faith for the purpose of Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

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

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, <bugattiresidences.miami>, be transferred to the Complainant.

/Marilena Comanescu/

Marilena Comanescu

Sole Panelist

Date: April 28, 2026