

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Mario Valentino S.p.A. v. Lynn Diehl
Case No. D2026-2081

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Mario Valentino S.p.A., Italy, represented by Società Italiana Brevetti S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is Lynn Diehl, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <valentinobymariovalentinoho.shop> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 18, 2026. On May 19, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 20, 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 (The RDAP server redacted the value, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 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 on May 25, 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 May 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 16, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Theda König Horowicz as the sole panelist in this matter on June 29, 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 an Italian company headquartered in Naples, Italy, which has been producing leather goods including shoes, bags, and fashion accessories since 1952, succeeding to the long-established Valentino family business.

The record includes ample evidence of the renown of the Complainant's VALENTINO mark in the international fashion world from the 1950s to the present, such that the leading search results for "Valentino" and "Valentino shoes" from Internet search engines refer to the Complainant. The Complainant's VALENTINO branded goods are sold through high-end retailers worldwide as well as online.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for VALENTINO and MARIO VALENTINO, including United States registration No. 951621 for the word mark VALENTINO, registered on January 30, 1973, Italian registration No. 438310 for the word mark MARIO VALENTINO, registered on July 21, 1986, and International Registration No. 505619 for the word mark MARIO VALENTINO, registered on September 29, 1986, designating, among other countries, the United States.

The Complainant also owns several domain names including the term "valentinobymariovalentino", such as <valentinobymariovalentino.it> and <valentinobymariovalentino.us> which are linked to its official website in Italian and English respectively, displaying the Complainant's social media accounts. In addition, the Complainant holds the domain name <mariovalentino.com> which has been in use since 1998.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 24, 2026 and directs to a CloudFlare webpage with a warning message indicating that the webpage has been blocked for security reasons.

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 disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its VALENTINO and MARIO VALENTINO trademarks, incorporating the marks in its entirety with the only difference being the additional elements "by" and "ho".

The Complainant states that it has not authorized the Respondent to use its marks, and there is no evidence that the Respondent is known by a corresponding name. The Complainant observes that the Respondent has not put the disputed domain name to use and has not employed the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide commercial offering, as it is linked to a webpage displaying a safety warning notice indicating that the access to the website has been blocked for protection from online attacks. The nature of the disputed domain name which incorporates the Complainant's trademarks in their entirety and substantially reproduces its principal domain name <valentinobymariovalentino.it> carries a risk of implied affiliation.

The Complainant points out that the Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant's mark, considering the structure of the disputed domain name which reproduces Complainant's trademarks in their entirety. The Complainant also cites prior UDRP decisions finding that its VALENTINO marks are well known globally.

Mario Valentino S.p.A. v. Yu Guo, WIPO Case No. [D2022-3160](#); and *Mario Valentino S.p.A. v. Jiaqin Huang*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-3916](#). Furthermore, the Complainant concludes that the disputed domain name is used in bad faith as it was registered without its authorization and as it resolves to a website presenting potential security risks. Finally, the Complainant mentions that the non-use of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith, considering the distinctiveness and reputation of Complainant's trademarks, the composition of the disputed domain name and the fact that the Respondent concealed its identity when registering the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which the Complainant must satisfy to succeed:

- (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 respect of 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 trademarks 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 rights in respect of the trademarks VALENTINO and MARIO VALENTINO for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

Both trademarks are entirely reproduced and recognizable within the disputed domain name. The addition of the terms "by" and "ho" in the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the trademarks. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 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 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 Complainant has stated not to have authorized the Respondent to use its trademarks VALENTINO and MARIO VALENTINO. The Complainant has also shown to hold and to use the domain names comprising the term "valentinobymariovalentino". The disputed domain name copies these domain names owned by the Complainant without authorization and the sole addition of the letters "ho" at the end of the disputed domain name does not change the fact that the Respondent intended to ride on the reputation of the Complainant and its trademark rights when registering the disputed domain name. In addition, the disputed domain name is linked to a webpage displaying safety warnings in relation to the relevant website.

These findings do not confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent in the disputed domain name.

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 was aware of the Complainant and its long-established and well-known VALENTINO and MARIO VALENTINO trademarks, using these in entirety in the disputed domain name. The composition and structure of the disputed domain name which copies the "valentinobymariovalentino" domain names owned by the Complainant is further evidence of this finding.

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.

Here the Panel notes the fact that the disputed domain name was linked to a webpage with a warning message indicating that the webpage has been blocked for security reasons. In addition, the nature of the disputed domain name which incorporates the Complainant's trademarks in their entirety and substantially reproduces its principal domain name <valentinobymariovalentino.it> carries a risk of implied affiliation.

Panels also 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, and this applies to the Respondent's disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's VALENTINO and MARIO VALENTINO trademarks and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that under 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 also takes note of the Respondent's apparent provision of false contact details in the registration of the disputed domain name and the Respondent's failure to submit a Response or otherwise communicate in this proceeding as indicative of bad faith.

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 <valentinobymariovalentino.ho.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Theda König Horowicz/

Theda König Horowicz

Sole Panelist

Date: July 17, 2026