ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Skorpio Limited v. 张永强
Case No. D2026-1191

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Skorpio Limited, Switzerland, represented by Keltie LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is 张永强, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <rickowens-au.com>, <rickowens-jp.com>, <rickowens-nl.com>, <rickowens-norge.com>, <rickowensschweiz.com>, and <rickowens-uk.com> are registered with Vantage of Convergence (Chengdu) Technology Co., Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 19, 2026. On March 19, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On March 20, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 20, 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 in English on March 20, 2026.

On March 20, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain names is Chinese. On March 20, 2026, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission.

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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 22, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 27, 2026.

The Center appointed Deanna Wong Wai Man as the sole panelist in this matter on May 4, 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 Skorpio Limited, a Swiss company which manages the intellectual property rights associated with the fashion brand RICK OWENS. The fashion designer Rick Owens first started his fashion and apparel business in Los Angeles, United States of America, in 1994, and subsequently expanded internationally, including through production and distribution operations in Italy. The RICK OWENS brand has become well known internationally in connection with luxury fashion goods, including clothing, footwear, and accessories, and operates retail stores in multiple jurisdictions worldwide.

The Complainant owns an international trademark portfolio for the RICK OWENS marks, including but not limited to: (i) International Trademark Registration No. 1026597 for RICK OWENS, registered on December 30, 2009; and (ii) European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 018510789 for RICK OWENS, registered on March 2, 2022. The Complainant's trademarks are registered in connection with goods in, inter alia, International Class 25, including clothing, footwear, and headgear. Additionally, the well-known status of the Complainant's RICK OWENS marks has previously been recognized in prior UDRP decisions. See, e.g., *Skorpio Limited v. Domain Admin, Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org) / Philipp Wulf, Philipp Wulf*, WIPO Case No. D2022-1488.

The disputed domain names were all registered on December 5, 2025. According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the disputed domain names resolve to websites purporting to offer RICK OWENS-branded clothing products for sale and displaying the Complainant's RICK OWENS mark without authorization. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain names direct to inactive websites.

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 the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's RICK OWENS trademark, as each of the disputed domain names incorporates the Complainant's mark in its entirety together with geographic terms or abbreviations such as "au", "nl", "uk", "jp", "norge", and "schweiz". The Complainant submits that such additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the Policy. The Complainant further contends that the RICK OWENS mark is well known internationally in connection with fashion goods and has previously been recognized in prior UDRP decisions.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Complainant asserts that it has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the RICK OWENS mark or to register domain names incorporating the mark. The Complainant also submits that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names and that the disputed domain names were used to resolve to websites offering purported RICK OWENS-branded products without authorization from the Complainant.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Complainant submits that its trademark rights significantly predate the registration of the disputed domain names and that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its RICK OWENS mark at the time of registration. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the associated websites.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issue: Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain names is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint and amended Complaint were filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that the Complainant and its representatives are not proficient in Chinese, that requiring translation of the Complaint and annexes into Chinese would impose substantial costs and delay, that the disputed domain names are composed of Latin-script terms targeting international markets, and that the websites previously associated with the disputed domain names contained English-language content offering purported RICK OWENS-branded products for sale.

The Respondent did not make any specific submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2 Substantive Issues

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 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, “au”, “nl”, “uk”, “jp”, “norge” preceded by hyphens, and “schweiz”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a 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 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 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.

Based on the evidence provided, the Panel notes that the Respondent was neither affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant to use the RICK OWENS mark, and there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names. The Panel further finds that there are no elements in the record indicating that the Respondent has made any bona fide or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, the record indicates that the disputed domain names were used for websites impersonating the Complainant, falsely presenting themselves as websites associated with the Complainant, and purporting to offer what are purported to be the Complainant’s RICK OWENS-branded products for sale to Internet users. In this regard, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed impersonation and passing off, 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 also finds that the disputed domain names carry a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. Each disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant’s well-known RICK OWENS mark in its entirety together with geographic terms or abbreviations such as “au”, “uk”, “nl”, “jp”, “norge”, and “schweiz”, which Internet users are likely to understand as references to official regional or country-specific websites of the Complainant. Such composition falsely suggests sponsorship, endorsement, or authorization by the Complainant and does not support any finding of rights or legitimate interests on the part of the Respondent. See section 2.5.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1.

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 Respondent has registered the disputed domain names which are confusingly similar to the Complainant's prior RICK OWENS trademark. The Panel further notes that previous panels applying the Policy have recognized the Complainant's RICK OWENS trademark as well known in prior UDRP proceedings, and the Panel agrees with this assessment. See, for instance, *Skorpio Limited v. Domain Admin, Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org) / Philipp Wulf, Philipp Wulf*, WIPO Case No. D2022-1488. Given the well-known nature of the Complainant's marks, together with the composition of the disputed domain names incorporating the trademark in its entirety alongside geographic terms suggestive of official regional websites of the Complainant, the Panel considers that the registration of the disputed domain names cannot credibly be attributed to coincidence. The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent deliberately and consciously targeted the Complainant and its trademarks at the time of registration. This is further confirmed by the fact that the disputed domain names previously resolved to websites impersonating the Complainant and purporting to offer RICK OWENS-branded products for sale. Therefore, the Panel accepts that the disputed domain names were registered in bad faith.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed impersonation and passing off constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. The Panel further finds that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's RICK OWENS trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites associated with the disputed domain names and the products purportedly offered on them. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Finally, the fact that the disputed domain names currently direct to inactive websites does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the third element of the Policy. To 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 and well-known nature of the Complainant's trademarks, and the composition of the disputed domain names, and the unlikelihood of good faith use thereof by the Respondent and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

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 names <rickowens-au.com>, <rickowens-jp.com>, <rickowens-nl.com>, <rickowens-norge.com>, <rickowensschweiz.com>, and <rickowens-uk.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Deanna Wong Wai Man/
Deanna Wong Wai Man
Sole Panelist
Date: May 18, 2026