

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Panini S.p.a. v. jl sabang utara  
Case No. D2026-1141

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Panini S.p.a., Italy, represented by Kopjra S.r.l, Italy.

The Respondent is jl sabang utara, Indonesia.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <panini365.org> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 17, 2026. On March 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On March 18, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (User #f5002687 Privacy, See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 19, 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 amended Complaint on March 20, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended 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 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 13, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 14, 2026.

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on April 20, 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 to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

#### **4. Factual Background**

The Complainant was founded in 1961 and is today a recognized brand in the collectibles industry. The company operates in over 120 countries, produces approximately one billion packets of stickers per year, and has been the official publisher of FIFA World Cup sticker albums since 1970.

The Complainant owns a portfolio of trademark registrations for the PANINI mark, spanning over 50 jurisdictions, for example European Union Trade Mark No. 003583499 (registered on July 14, 2005).

The Domain Name was registered on January 16, 2026. The Complainant has documented that the Respondent has used the Domain Name to link to a gambling webpage in Indonesian.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant argues common law rights from over sixty years of continuous worldwide use, and provides evidence of trademark registrations. The Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark as the Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's entire trademark with the addition of "365". The addition does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the trademark. To the contrary, it directly evokes the Complainant's well-known product line "Panini FIFA 365", a globally distributed sticker published since 2015.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the PANINI trademark in any manner. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the name "panini365" or any variation thereof. The Respondent's use of the Domain Name does not constitute a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The Respondent's webpage links to a gambling activity that is illegal in Indonesia. The Respondent's website appears to be a fraudulent operation. The PANINI brand is used to lure users. This is not bona fide use under the Policy.

The Complainant believes that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant when the Respondent registered the Domain Name. The Complainant's PANINI mark enjoys high consumer recognition worldwide, and is a well-known mark within the meaning of Article 6bis of the Paris Convention. The Respondent's Domain Name serves as a gateway to illegal activity. The Respondent executes a deliberate exploitation of the Complainant's reputation through a coordinated scheme. It tarnishes the Complainant's trademark. Finally, the Respondent has failed to respond to the communication sent by the Complainant that preceded these proceedings and tried to conceal its identity.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

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 Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has established that it has rights in the trademark PANINI. In this case, the Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's trademark with the addition of "365". The addition does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the trademark. For the purpose of assessing confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel may ignore the generic Top-Level Domain, see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

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

While 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 often impossible 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. 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.

Based on the evidence, the Respondent is not affiliated or related to the Complainant in any way. There is no evidence that the Respondent has registered the Domain Name as a trademark or acquired trademark rights. There is no evidence of the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, the use of the Domain Name is rather evidence of bad faith, as discussed below. The Panel finds also that the composition of the Domain Name signals the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the Domain Name and the Complainant.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

### **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.

The Respondent knew of the Complainant when it registered the Domain Name. It follows from the fame of the Complainant and the composition of the Domain Name, which evokes the Complainant's well-known product line "Panini FIFA 365", globally distributed for over ten years before the Domain Name was registered. The Respondent has not offered any explanation as to why it registered a domain name confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, nor provided any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use of the Domain Name. On the contrary, the Respondent's use is evidence of bad faith use.

The use of the Domain Name to link to an illegal gambling webpage in Indonesian and the fact that the Respondent has failed to respond to the Complaint and appears to have tried to conceal its identify, are further indications of bad faith.

Based on the available record, 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 the Domain Name <panini365.org> transferred to the Complainant.

*/Mathias Lilleengen/*

**Mathias Lilleengen**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 23, 2026