

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Calzedonia S.p.A. v. 黄保传 (huang baochuan, bao chuan huang)
Case No. D2026-2496

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is 黄保传 (huang baochuan, bao chuan huang), China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <calzedoniaspana.com> is registered with Kenpai International Technology Limited, the disputed domain name <calzedoniashopsrbija.com> is registered with Xiamen 35.Com Information Co., Ltd., and the disputed domain name <calzedoniasi.com> is registered with OnlineNic, Inc. d/b/a China-Channel.com. Kenpai International Technology Limited, Xiamen 35.Com Information Co., Ltd., and OnlineNic, Inc. d/b/a China-Channel.com are hereinafter referred to as the “Registrars”.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 9, 2026. On June 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 11, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Registration Private) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 12, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrars, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. On June 12, 2026, the Center also informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreements for the disputed domain names is Chinese. On June 15, 2026, the Complainant requested English and Chinese to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceeding commenced on June 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Sebastian M.W. Hughes as the sole panelist in this matter on July 16, 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

A. Complainant

The Complainant is a company headquartered in Italy and founded in 1986, carrying on business as a designer, manufacturer and distributor of hosiery, lingerie, swimwear and apparel under the trade mark CALZEDONIA (the "Trade Mark"), and operating stores in more than 50 countries worldwide.

The Complainant is the owner of registrations in numerous jurisdictions for the Trade Mark, including International registration No. 1,326,138, with a registration date of June 30, 2016; European Union registration No.001874452, with a registration date of April 3, 2002; and Chinese registration No. 8114120, with a registration date of March 21, 2011.

In addition to its bricks and mortar stores, the Complainant also has a substantial online business, promoting and selling its products to customers worldwide under the Trade Mark.

B. Respondent

The Respondent is apparently an individual located in China.

C. The Disputed Domain Names

Each of the disputed domain names was registered on April 11, 2026.

D. Use of the Disputed Domain Names

The disputed domain name <calzedoniaspana.com> was previously resolved to a website in English and Spanish (the "Website") featuring the Trade Mark; purportedly offering for sale the Complainant's products; displaying the copyright notice "Copyright © 2026 Caledonia Espana. All rights reserved"; and inviting Internet users to enter their contact and credit card details. As at the date of this Decision, it is no longer resolved to an active website.

The disputed domain names <calzedoniashopsrbija.com> and <calzedoniasi.com> have not been used in respect of an active website.

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 Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name <calzedoniaspana.com> in order to impersonate the Complainant and likely engage in phishing/identity theft.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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. The Panel notes that the named registrant disclosed by the Registrars would appear to be the same person (or at least the disputed domain names are subject to common control), save that the romanized pinyin text for the Respondent's name uses the convention in China of surname first ("huang baochuan") for two of the disputed domain names, whereas the Respondent's name is rendered with the surname last ("bao chuan huang") for the third disputed domain name. The Panel notes further there are strong similarities in the registrant contact information disclosed by the Registrars for each of the disputed domain names, including the use of the same street, district, city and province address, and the disputed domain names were registered on the same day, following the same naming pattern.

Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name <calzedoniaspana.com> is English, while the language of the Registration Agreements for the remaining 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 was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English and Chinese.

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).

The Panel notes that the Website previously provided content in both English and Spanish, and that the language of the Registration Agreements for one of the disputed domain names is Chinese. Although the Respondent has been notified the Complaint including instructions on the language of the proceeding in Chinese and English, the Respondent has chosen not to comment on the language of the proceeding or to file any response in either Chinese or English.

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.

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 trade mark and the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the Trade Mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, “si”, “sespana” and “shopsrbija”) 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 Trade 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (as applicable to this case - in respect of the disputed domain name <calzedoniaspana.com>: impersonation/passing off and potential 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.

In light of the manner of registration and use of the disputed domain name <calzedoniaspana.com>, the Panel finds that the requisite element of bad faith has been made out pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Further, panels have also held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (as applicable to this case - in respect of the disputed domain name <calzedonias espana.com>: impersonation/passing off and potential phishing) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

The fact that the disputed domain name <calzedonias espana.com> no longer resolves to an active website does not change the Panel's finding of bad faith.

In all the circumstances of this proceeding, particularly noting the distinctiveness or reputation of the Trade Mark, the composition of the disputed domain names, and the prior use of the disputed domain name <calzedonias espana.com>, the Panel finds that the fact the disputed domain names <calzedoniashopsrbija.com> and <calzedoniasi.com> have not been resolved to any active websites, does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

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

Accordingly, 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 <calzedonias espana.com>, <calzedoniashopsrbija.com> and <calzedoniasi.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Sebastian M.W. Hughes/

Sebastian M.W. Hughes

Sole Panelist

Date: July 24, 2026