

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bulgari S.p.A v. Garini sarabi, payam basiri, rn mark, Garini sarabi, Novéo Clinic

Case No. D2026-2095

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Bulgari S.p.A, Italy, represented by SafeNames Ltd., United Kingdom.

The Respondents are Garini sarabi, United Arab Emirates, payam basiri, rn mark, United Arab Emirates, and Garini sarabi, Novéo Clinic, United Arab Emirates.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <bulgari-billing.net>, <bulgari-invoice.com>, and <bvlgari-billing.com> are registered with Key-Systems GmbH (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 15, 2026. On May 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On May 18, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 20, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar(s), requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed amended Complaints on May 21, 2026 and on June 2, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 6, 2026. The Respondent payam basiri, rn mark sent email communications to the Center on June 3, 2026, June 16, 2026, and on July 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Gill Mansfield as the sole panelist in this matter on July 10, 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 founded in 1884 by Sotirios Voulgaris. The Complainant operates in the luxury goods and hotels markets, and is particularly well-known for high-end jewellery, watches, handbags and fragrance products. It is headquartered in Rome, Italy, and has more than 320 retail locations worldwide. The BULGARI trademark is derived from the founder's name (Vougaris). The Complainant's trademark is written both as BVLGARI in the classic Latin alphabet and BULGARI in the modern alphabet, and the two are used synonymously. The Complainant uses the BVLGARI/BULGARI trademark as part of its brand logo and to promote its services via social media, and engages in significant promotion of the brand worldwide using the trademarks.

The Complainant has a portfolio of international trademark registrations for the BULGARI and BVLGARI trademarks, including (inter alia) the following:

International trademark registration number 452694 for BULGARI (word mark) registered on May 15, 1980 in classes 11, 14, 20, and 21.

International trademark registration number 494237 for BVLGARI (figurative mark) registered on July 5 1985 in classes 3, 8, 11, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21, 25, and 34.

United States of America trademark registration number 1694380 for BVLGARI (word mark) registered on June 16, 1992 in class 18.

The Complainant registered the domain name <bulgari.com> on February 17, 1998. This domain name directs to the Complainant's official website, "www.bulgari.com", where Internet users are able to access all of the Complainant's product lines, and locate the Complainant's stores and authorised retailers worldwide. The Complainant's official website receives over two million visits per month from users around the world.

The disputed domain names <bulgari-invoice.com> (registered by Garini Sarabi) and <bvgari-billing.com> (registered by Garini sarabi, Novéo Clinic) were registered on January 1, 2026 and the disputed domain name <bulgari-billing.net> (registered by payam basiri, rn mark) was registered on January 20, 2026. At the time of the Complaint the disputed domain names did not resolve to active webpages.

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 BVLGARI/BULGARI marks. The Complainant refers to the multiple trademarks that it holds in the terms BVLGARI/BULGARI across multiple jurisdictions, and highlights the goodwill and recognition that those marks have attained. It argues that the disputed domain names encompass the entirety of either the Complainant's BVLGARI or BULGARI mark with the addition of the keyword "billing" or "invoice", separated from the mark by a hyphen. It contends that the BVLGARI/BULGARI marks are the dominant and only

distinctive element in the disputed domain names, and that the additional terms do not alleviate the likelihood of confusion between the Complainant's marks and the disputed domain names. The Complainant also contends that the generic Top-Level Domains (gTLD) are standard registration requirements and, as such, are to be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. It submits that, to the best of the Complainant's knowledge, the Respondents do not have any registered or unregistered trademark rights to the terms BVLGARI or BULGARI. It also submits that the Respondents have never received any licence from the Complainant to use domain names featuring the BVLGARI/BULGARI mark. The Complainant argues that the disputed domain names do not resolve to active webpages and that such non-use should not be considered to constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services. It further contends that the terms used in the disputed domain names are not phrases a trader would legitimately choose unless seeking to create an impression of association with the Complainant. The Complainant submits that the Respondents are not commonly known by the disputed domain names, are not offering any genuine goods or services, and that there is no evidence that the Respondents intended to use the disputed domain names in a legitimate noncommercial way.

Finally, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. It states that the Complainant's earliest trademark registrations pre-date the creation date of the disputed domain names by approximately 47 years. It argues that substantial goodwill has accrued in the marks since the establishment of the Complainant in 1884 and that the BVLGARI/BULGARI name has become synonymous with high-end and stylistically unique luxury accessories. The Complainant contends that Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a famous or widely known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith, and argues that this is the case here. The Complainant also argues that the addition of the words "billing" and "invoice", separated from the mark by a hyphen, only reinforce the connection to the Complainant, as Internet users may perceive the disputed domain names as associated with the Complainant's financial departments. The Complainant notes that the disputed domain names do not resolve to active webpages and submits that non-use would not prevent a finding of bad faith.

B. Respondents

The Respondents did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions. However, the Respondent who is the registrant of the disputed domain name <bulgari-billing.net> sent email communications to the Center on June 3, 2026, June 16, 2026, and on July 7, 2026.

In the email of June 3, 2026 the Respondent acknowledged receipt of the Complaint. That email states that "without admitting any liability, wrongdoing, bad faith, or control over any domain name not registered under my name and/ or under my control, I confirm that I do not wish to contest the Complaint". The email goes on to offer to transfer any disputed domain name registered under their name and under their control, free of charge. The email also says that the sender of the email does not admit ownership, management, or control of domains registered with other registrant details but has no objection to the transfer of all of the disputed domain names.

That email comes from a Gmail address that comprises a series of numbers rather than a named or identifiable individual. The emails of June 16, 2026 and July 7, 2026, which come from the same email address, both repeat the above request to know who to transfer the domains, referred to in that email, to.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy the Complainant carries the burden of proving:

- (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights,
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The Panel will address this procedural issue before moving to consideration of the criteria set out in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes the following factors from the available record indicating common control:

- The disputed domain names all share a common structure: comprising the Complainant's mark (used in full), followed by a hyphen, and a descriptive term relating to finance or payment ("billing" for two of the disputed domain names and "invoicing" for the other), and the TLD.
- The disputed domain names were all registered within a short period of each other in January 2026, with two of the disputed domain names being registered on the same date (January 1, 2026) and the third only a few weeks later (January 20, 2026).
- The disputed domain names were all registered with the same Registrar (Key-Systems GmbH, Germany).
- The disputed domain names were all hosted using the same hosting provider (Leaseweb Deutschland GmbH) at the point of registration, and the disputed domain names <bulgari-billing.net> and <bvlgari-billing.com> were both hosted in the exact same IP address, mail and name servers at the point of registration.
- The registrant addresses for all of the disputed domain names are in United Arab Emirates. To the extent that there are inconsistencies in the registrant addresses the Panel accepts the Complainant's contention that the discrepancies suggest that the registration details for the disputed domain names are likely associated with false, incomplete or stolen details.
- The registrant name for two of the disputed domain names <bulgari-invoice.com> and <bvlgari-billing.com> is identical: Garini Sarabi. The admin, technical and billing address is also identical for both of these domains. Again, to the extent that there are inconsistencies between the registrant details the Panel accepts the Complainant's contention that the discrepancies suggest that the registration details for the disputed domain names are likely associated with false, incomplete or stolen details.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request for consolidation. The Panel notes the informal email correspondence from the Respondent which is the registrant of the disputed domain name <bulgari-billing.net>, set out above. However, the Panel finds that the facts above support the conclusion that the disputed domain names are under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Respondents have not presented any arguments as to why consolidation would be unfair or inequitable, and the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

B. 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 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, the addition of the terms "-billing" and "-invoice") 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 applicable Top-Level Domain (TLD) in a domain name is a standard registration requirement and as such the TLDs ".net" and ".com" in the disputed domain names are disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

C. 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.

In particular, the Complainant has not licensed or permitted the Respondent to use the BVLGARI/BULGARI trademarks. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. There is also no evidence of use, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services, or of any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert customers.

The disputed domain names consist of the use of the Complainant's marks in their entirety with the addition of a hyphen followed by the descriptive terms "billing" or "invoice". These are both terms which are commonly used as extensions in connection with, or to denote, finance or payment functions. As such the disputed domain names could be perceived as an extension of the Complainant's legitimate domain name.

The Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain names is such as to carry a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant's trademark which cannot constitute fair use as it effectively impersonates the Complainant, or suggests affiliation with or sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1).

In addition, according to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw from the lack of response of the Respondent such inferences as it considers appropriate. The Panel is of the view that the lack of a substantive response to the Complainant's contentions from the Respondent further corroborates the absence of any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain names.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

D. 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.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant's trademark registrations for the BVLGARI/BULGARI marks pre-date the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain names by almost 47 years. The Panel also notes the long history of the Complainant, dating back to 1884, and the international reputation and distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark, and finds that the BVLGARI/BULGARI marks are widely-known worldwide.

Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark, and particularly in the case of coined or fanciful marks, by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Given the reputation in the Complainant's trademark it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's mark at the date on which the disputed domain names were registered, and the Panel finds that the Respondent has targeted the Complainant's well-known mark. In making this finding, the Panel again notes the composition of the disputed domain names, which incorporate the entirety of either the BVLGARI or the BULGARI mark, with the addition of a hyphen, followed by the descriptive words "billing" or "invoice". As noted above, these are descriptive terms that Internet users may perceive as extensions likely to be used by the finance or commercial teams of the Complainant, and for which the Panel considers that there is no plausible legitimate use in conjunction with the Complainant's marks.

As noted above, the disputed domain names do not resolve to an active website or webpage.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name 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 trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain names, 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 <bulgari-billing.net>, <bulgari-invoice.com>, and <bvlgari-billing.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gill Mansfield/

Gill Mansfield

Sole Panelist

Date: July 24, 2026