

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Calzedonia S.p.A. v. Zhang Qiang
Case No. D2026-1809

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Calzedonia S.p.A., Italy, represented by Novagraaf Nederland B.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the).

The Respondent is Zhang Qiang, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <intimissimiuruguay.com> is registered with Paknic (Private) Limited (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 1, 2026. On May 1, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 1, 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 May 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 28, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Enrique Bardales Mendoza as the sole panelist in this matter on June 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, Calzedonia S.p.A., is an Italian company founded in 1986 and headquartered in Verona, Italy. It is active in the fashion industry and specializes in the design, manufacture, and distribution of hosiery, lingerie, swimwear, and apparel, which it markets under several brands, including the INTIMISSIMI brand. The Complainant operates a vertically integrated business model and distributes its products through a network of several thousand mono-brand stores in more than 50 countries across Europe, North and South America, and Asia, as well as through its official websites and online platforms. The Complainant reports annual revenues exceeding EUR three billion in recent years.

The Complainant is the owner of multiple trademark registrations incorporating the term INTIMISSIMI, used in connection with, among others, apparel, lingerie, and related goods and services. These include, for example:

- INTIMISSIMI trademark, Uruguay, registration number 443399, registered on February 10, 2016, covering goods and services in Classes 3 and 35.
- INTIMISSIMI trademark, European Union, registration number 011941911, registered on November 20, 2013, covering goods and services in Classes 3, 25, and 35.
- INTIMISSIMI trademark, International Registration, registration number 1178607, registered on June 28, 2013, covering goods and services in Classes 3, 25, and 35.
- INTIMISSIMI UOMO word/device trademark, International Registration, registration number 1572808, registered on November 5, 2020, covering goods and services in Classes 3, 25, and 35.
-

The Complainant likewise operates official websites and digital platforms through which it markets and sells its products under the INTIMISSIMI brand.

The disputed domain name <intimissimiuuguay.com> was registered on June 27, 2023. According to the evidence on record, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that reproduces the Complainant's INTIMISSIMI and INTIMISSIMI UOMO trademarks and logos, displays marketing and campaign imagery used by the Complainant (including images of a celebrity featured in the Complainant's advertising), and purports to offer the Complainant's products for sale through an online shopping interface. The website displays no disclaimer of any relationship with the Complainant and invites visitors to submit personal information, including their full name, email address, telephone number, and details concerning their place of residence or business.

The Respondent is Zhang Qiang, identified in the Registrar's verification response as the registrant of the disputed domain name, with an address in China. The Respondent did not reply to the Complaint, and no information about the Respondent is available beyond the registration data and the matters established by the evidence on record.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for the transfer of the disputed domain name.

In particular, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its INTIMISSIMI trademarks, since it reproduces such denomination in its entirety together with the additional geographic term "uruguay". According to the Complainant, the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is a standard registration requirement that is to be disregarded for the purposes of the comparison.

Furthermore, the Complainant alleges that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. It asserts that the Respondent has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant, nor any authorization, license, or consent, whether express or implied, to use the mark in the disputed

domain name in any form; that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name; and that the Respondent holds no registered trademark corresponding to it. The Complainant further submits that the disputed domain name resolves to a website that impersonates the Complainant and is used to deceive Internet users as well as invites the user to provide personal data potentially for phishing purposes, conduct which can never confer rights or legitimate interests.

On the other hand, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant submits that its INTIMISSIIMI trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain name and is widely known; that the Respondent was plainly aware of, and targeted, the Complainant's trademark; and that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name intentionally to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and of the products offered on it, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of registering domain names that combine third parties' trademarks with a country name, relying in this respect on 29 prior decisions under the Policy said to involve the Respondent, all of which were decided in favor of the respective complainants.

On the basis of all the foregoing, the Complainant requests that the transfer of the disputed domain name be ordered.

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

The Complainant has shown that it holds rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. The evidence on record demonstrates that the Complainant owns numerous valid and subsisting registrations for the trademark INTIMISSIIMI in multiple jurisdictions.

The Panel considers that the trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. In this case, the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's INTIMISSIIMI trademark in its entirety, together with the additional term "uruguay", which does not prevent the Complainant's trademark from being clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. Consequently, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (in this case, "uruguay") may be relevant in the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel considers that the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The Panel further notes that the gTLD ".com" is a standard registration requirement and, as such, is disregarded for the purposes of the comparison under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.

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. In particular, the Respondent has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to use the INTIMISSIMI trademark or to register a domain name incorporating it; there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name; and there is no evidence of any bona fide offering of goods or services, or of any legitimate noncommercial or fair use, of 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.

Moreover, the manner in which the disputed domain name is used precludes any finding of rights or legitimate interests. The evidence shows that the disputed domain name resolves to a website that is deliberately designed to appear as the Complainant’s official website: it reproduces the Complainant’s INTIMISSIMI and INTIMISSIMI UOMO trademarks and logos, uses the Complainant’s campaign and product imagery, purports to offer the Complainant’s products for sale, displays no disclaimer of (the lack of) affiliation, and invites visitors to submit sensitive personal information. Such use amounts to passing off and bears the hallmarks of a phishing scheme. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed passing off and phishing) 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.

With respect to registration, the Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark rights. The Complainant’s INTIMISSIMI trademark is distinctive and predates the registration of the disputed domain name, and the disputed domain name combines the Complainant’s trademark with the name of a country in which the Complainant holds registered rights. Decisively, the website to which the disputed domain name resolves reproduces the Complainant’s INTIMISSIMI UOMO word/device mark, uses the Complainant’s own campaign and product imagery, and purports to offer the Complainant’s products. This makes it clear that the Respondent had the Complainant and its trademark squarely in mind and registered the disputed domain name precisely in order to target the Complainant. The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

With respect to use, the Panel finds that, by using the disputed domain name to operate a website that passes off the Complainant and purportedly offers the Complainant’s products, the Respondent has

intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and of the products offered on it. This constitutes evidence of registration and use in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

The Panel further finds that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of conduct within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy. The un rebutted evidence shows that the Respondent has been the named respondent in 29 prior proceedings under the Policy, each decided in favor of the respective complainant, concerning domain names that combine well-known third-party trademarks with a country name – precisely the pattern followed in the present case. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.2 and e.g. *Leatherman Tool Group, Inc. v. zhang qiang*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3233](#).

In addition, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed passing off and phishing) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name for these purposes constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

In light of the foregoing, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of 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 name <intimissimiuruguay.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Enrique Bardales Mendoza/

Enrique Bardales Mendoza

Sole Panelist

Date: June 18, 2026