ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Guccio Gucci S.p.A. v. Natalie Wong
Case No. D2026-1525

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Guccio Gucci S.p.A., Italy, represented by Studio Barbero S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is Natalie Wong, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <hr-gucci.com> is registered with Hello Internet Corp (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 10, 2026. On April 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 14, 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 (Not disclosed) and April 14, 2026 contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on 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 April 15, 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 April 17, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 7, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Daniel Kraus as the sole panelist in this matter on June 2, 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, Guccio Gucci S.p.A., is an Italian public limited company (società per azioni). The Complainant belongs to the international luxury goods conglomerate Kering, one of the leading groups worldwide in apparel and accessories. The Gucci Fashion House was founded in 1921 by Guccio Gucci in Florence, initially as a leather goods company and luggage store. Over the past century, the Gucci brand has grown into one of the world's leading luxury fashion houses, producing fashion items including leather goods, apparel, footwear, and accessories, with stores in major international cities including Milan, New York, London, Paris, Tokyo, and Hong Kong. The Complainant converted into a publicly-owned company in 1995 and entered into a strategic alliance with Kering in 1999. The Complainant was ranked 69th in the 2025 Interbrand "Best Global Brands" list, with a brand value of USD 11.6 billion, and is supported by intensive advertising campaigns in international magazines and on social media.

The Complainant holds numerous trademark registrations worldwide for the GUCCI mark. The Complaint and amendment to the Complaint include full listings of marks registered in jurisdictions around the world. The Panel notes the following registered trademark rights as particularly relevant to the present proceedings:

(i) International Trademark Registration No. 429833 for GUCCI (word mark):
- Jurisdiction: International
- Date of registration: March 30, 1977
- Goods/services: Classes 3, 14, 18 and 25

(ii) International Trademark Registration No. 457952 for GUCCI (word mark):
- Jurisdiction: International
- Date of registration: December 16, 1980
- Goods/services: All classes

(iii) Hong Kong Trademark Registration No. 1982B1085AA for GUCCI (word mark):
- Jurisdiction: Hong Kong
- Date of registration: January 19, 1979
- Goods/services: Classes 3, 14, 18 and 25

All of the above registrations predate the disputed domain name registration by several decades. The Complainant also holds, inter alia, European Union Trade Mark No. 000121988 for GUCCI (word mark), filed on April 1, 1996 and registered on November 24, 1998, in all classes, as well as additional Hong Kong trademark registrations (Nos. 19913294AA registered on September 30, 1991, 199301038AA registered on March 16, 1992, and 301022372 registered on August 20, 2008), all of which cover various classes and are registered in the Respondent's purported jurisdiction. The Complainant is the registered owner of all cited trademarks; no relevant disclaimers are noted in the trademark registrations of record.

The Complainant also operates the domain name <gucci.com>, registered on June 5, 1996, through which it promotes the GUCCI brand and offers its products for sale worldwide.

The disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent on March 10, 2026, without the Complainant's authorization. Since its registration, the disputed domain name has resolved to an error page, specifically displaying a Cloudflare "Connection timed out" error (error code 522, "Host Error"). Additionally, the Complainant's verifications revealed that mail exchanger (MX) records are configured in the DNS zone for the domain name, indicating that it may be used for email communications from addresses based on [...]@hr-gucci.com.

Prior to filing the Complaint, the Complainant's representative instructed a web agency to contact the Respondent to ascertain its intentions regarding the disputed domain name. On March 11, 2026, the web agency sent a message via the Registrar, and sent a reminder on March 13, 2026. On March 16, 2026, the support service of WebNIC responded on behalf of the Respondent, confirming that the registrant had been informed of the web agency's interest and stating that the minimum offer was USD 300. The web agency's counter-offer of USD 50–100 was rejected as below the minimum. On March 23, 2026, the Complainant's representative sent a formal cease-and-desist letter via the Registrar, demanding cessation of use and free transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant. A reminder was sent on March 27, 2026, and the Registrar confirmed it would be forwarded to the Respondent. No response was received from the Respondent at any stage.

The Respondent is purportedly an individual based in Hong Kong, China, as disclosed by the Registrar following the filing of the Complaint. The Respondent does not appear to have any business, contractual, or other relationship with the Complainant. No trademark application or registration for GUCCI has been identified in the Respondent's name. The Respondent has previously been named as respondent in at least two UDRP proceedings involving domain names incorporating well-known third-party trademarks: *Toll Bros., Inc. v. Natalie Wong*, Claim No. FA2603002209015, and *Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc. v. Natalie Wong*, Claim No. FA2602002206223, both of which resulted in the transfer of the disputed domain names to the respective complainants.

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.

With respect to the first element, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name entirely incorporates the registered and well-known trademark GUCCI, and that the addition of the prefix "hr" (commonly understood as an abbreviation for "human resources"), a hyphen, and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The Complainant invokes WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), sections 1.7, 1.8, and 1.11.1 in support of this position.

With respect to the second element, the Complainant contends that: (i) the Respondent is not a licensee, authorized agent, or otherwise affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized to use the GUCCI mark; (ii) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and no trademark registration for GUCCI exists in the Respondent's name; (iii) the passive holding of the disputed domain name cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use; (iv) the combination of GUCCI with the prefix "hr" creates a misleading impression that the disputed domain name is officially operated by the Complainant's Human Resources department, which negates any claim to legitimate interests, with reference to WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1; and (v) the directly analogous UDRP decision *Haemonetics Corporation v. Paul Wallace*, WIPO Case No. D2025-1024, supports the conclusion that the impersonation risk created by combining a well-known trademark with "hr" cannot give rise to legitimate interests.

With respect to the third element, the Complainant contends that: (i) given the worldwide fame of the GUCCI mark since 1921, the Respondent could not have been unaware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration; (ii) the Respondent engaged a broker seeking a minimum of USD 300 for the disputed domain name, demonstrating registration for the primary purpose of selling it at a price exceeding out-of-pocket costs (paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy); (iii) passive holding of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith use under the doctrine established in *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. D2000-0003, in view of the totality of circumstances; (iv) the configuration of MX records creates a potential for phishing and impersonation by email, which constitutes bad faith use, citing *bioMérieux v. Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC / Milton Bardmess*, WIPO Case No. D2020-3499; (v) the Respondent's failure to respond to the cease-and-desist letter is evidence of bad faith; and (vi) the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of bad faith conduct by registering domain names incorporating third-party trademarks, as evidenced by the two prior UDRP proceedings referenced above (paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy).

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 Complainant has demonstrated registered trademark rights in the GUCCI mark through numerous International, European Union, and national registrations, the earliest of which dates to 1977, all predating the disputed domain name registration by several decades. The GUCCI mark is moreover widely recognized as a famous and well-known luxury brand, as established in numerous prior UDRP decisions involving the Complainant's trademark.

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.

The mark GUCCI is entirely and recognizably reproduced within the disputed domain name. The trademark GUCCI is the dominant and clearly identifiable element of the disputed domain name.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "hr" and a hyphen) 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 name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

As is well established, the gTLD ".com" is disregarded for purposes of the confusing similarity analysis. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

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 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, authorized agent, or affiliate of the Complainant and has not been authorized to use the GUCCI trademark in any manner. There is no evidence that the Respondent has ever been commonly known by the domain name or a name corresponding to it, and no trademark application or registration for GUCCI has been identified in the Respondent's name. The disputed domain name has been passively held, resolving to an error page since registration. Such passive holding does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c)(iii).

Furthermore, the composition of the disputed domain name, pairing the famous GUCCI mark with the prefix "hr", carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant, falsely suggesting that the disputed domain name is operated by the Complainant's Human Resources department. As stated in WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1, even where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term, UDRP panels have largely held that such a combination cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. This principle was applied in the directly analogous matter *Haemonetics Corporation v. Paul Wallace*, WIPO Case No. D2025-1024, where the Panel found that combining a well-known trademark with the term "hr" uses the risk of implied affiliation to mislead Internet users expecting to find a job opportunity or contact information for the complainant.

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 finds that multiple circumstances, viewed in their totality, demonstrate that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Given the fame and notoriety of the GUCCI mark which has been in continuous and extensive use since 1921, consistently ranked among the most valuable luxury brands globally, and the subject of trademark registrations across virtually all jurisdictions since the 1970s, it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights at the time of registering the disputed domain name on March 10, 2026.

As already found in *Guccio Gucci S.p.A., v. Bravia Stoli*, WIPO Case No. D2009-1170, the GUCCI mark is a famous luxury brand which could not have reasonably escaped the Respondent's attention when registering the disputed domain name. The deliberate pairing of GUCCI with the abbreviation "hr" further evidences that the Respondent knowingly targeted the Complainant and its trademark.

Under paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy: The correspondence between the web agency instructed by the Complainant and the broker acting for the Respondent via WebNIC reveals that the Respondent had arranged for the sale of the disputed domain name, insisting on a minimum price of USD 300, an amount that exceeds the documented out-of-pocket registration costs. Noting the distinctive nature and fame of the GUCCI mark, the inherently misleading nature of the disputed domain name, and the Respondent's pattern of targeting third-party trademarks, this supports the inference that the domain name was registered primarily for the purpose of selling it to the Complainant, a competitor, or a third party with an interest in the trademark, at a price exceeding out-of-pocket costs.

Under paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy: The Respondent has engaged in a pattern of registering domain names incorporating well-known third-party trademarks. Two prior UDRP proceedings against the same Respondent, *Toll Bros., Inc. v. Natalie Wong*, Claim No. FA2603002209015, and *Warner Bros. Entertainment Inc. v. Natalie Wong*, Claim No. FA2602002206223, both resulting in transfer of the disputed domain names to the respective complainants, establish that the Respondent has engaged in a clear pattern of abusive domain name registration targeting third-party trademark owners. As stated in WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.2, establishing such a pattern requires as few as two prior instances, a threshold that is met here.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. 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 reputation of the Complainant's GUCCI mark and the composition of the disputed domain name, incorporating the GUCCI mark in its entirety with the addition of "hr", a term closely associated with the Complainant's internal organizational structure 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. The Respondent's failure to submit any response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use reinforces this finding.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. Here, the establishment of MX records for [...]@hr-gucci.com email addresses, enabling the sending and receipt of email communications that would falsely appear to originate from the Complainant's Human Resources department or affiliated entities, supports an inference of bad faith, given the confusing similarity with the Complainant's well-known trademark and the obvious risk of impersonation.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Respondent's failure to respond to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter and reminders, and its default in the present proceedings, provide additional indicia 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 <hr-gucci.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Daniel Kraus/
Daniel Kraus
Sole Panelist
Date: June 16, 2026