

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Confederazione Nazionale Coldiretti v. Domains Administrator, Telemar Spa
Case No. D2026-2685

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Confederazione Nazionale Coldiretti, Italy, represented by Società Italiana Brevetti S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is Domains Administrator, Telemar Spa, Italy.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <coldiretti.biz> and <coldiretti.info> are registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 19, 2026. On June 22, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 22, 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 ("the RDAP server redacted a part of the value") and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 23, 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 June 23, 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 June 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 20, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Edoardo Fano as the sole panelist in this matter on July 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.

The Panel has not received any requests from the Complainant or the Respondent regarding further submissions, waivers or extensions of deadlines, and the Panel has not found it necessary to request any further information from the Parties.

Having reviewed the communication records in the case file, the Panel finds that the Center has discharged its responsibility under the Rules, paragraph 2(a) "to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to [the] Respondent". Therefore, the Panel shall issue its Decision based upon the Complaint, the Policy, the Rules and the Supplemental Rules and without the benefit of a response from the Respondent.

The language of the proceeding is English, being the language of the Registration Agreement, as per paragraph 11(a) of the Rules.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is the largest agricultural organizations in Italy and one of the most influential farming associations in Europe, founded in 1944, operating as a union to represent individual farmers, cooperatives, agri-food enterprises, fisheries, and the broader supply chain, and becoming a key stakeholder in shaping agricultural policy and food regulation in Italy and at the European Union level. The Complainant holds unregistered trademark rights and established common law rights in the trademark COLDIRETTI through extensive and continuous use from 1944, and owns several trademark registrations for COLDIRETTI, among which the following one:

- Italian Trademark Registration No. 0001387904 for COLDIRETTI and design, registered on December 13, 2010.

The Complainant also operates on the Internet, its official website being "www.coldiretti.it", and the domain name <coldiretti.it> was registered on October 10, 1996.

The Complainant provided evidence in support of the above.

The disputed domain names were registered on the following dates: <coldiretti.info> on October 4, 2001, and <coldiretti.biz> on November 7, 2001. The disputed domain name <coldiretti.info> resolves to an "under construction" webpage showing the contact details of the Respondent, while the disputed domain name <coldiretti.biz> is inactive.

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 states that the disputed domain names are identical to its unregistered and then registered trademark COLDIRETTI, as the disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's trademark in its entirety.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names since it has not been authorized by the Complainant to register the disputed domain names, it is not commonly known by the disputed domain names and it is not making either a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain names in bad faith, since the Complainant's trademark COLDIRETTI is well known in Italy, the country of the Respondent. Therefore, the Respondent targeted the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain names, and the Complainant contends that the passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

The Respondent has made no reply to the Complainant's contentions and is in default. In reference to paragraphs 5(f) and 14 of the Rules, no exceptional circumstances explaining the default have been put forward or are apparent from the record.

A respondent is not obliged to participate in a proceeding under the Policy, but if it fails to do so, reasonable facts asserted by a complainant may be taken as true, and appropriate inferences, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, may be drawn. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.3.

6. Discussion and Findings

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

- (i) the disputed domain names are 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 names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are 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 trademark and the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Based on the unrebutted record presented, the Panel finds that COLDIRETTI has become a distinctive identifier in connection with the Complainant's services offered under the mentioned sign sufficient to confer trademark rights to the Complainant. The Complainant has also shown registered trademark rights in COLDIRETTI for the purposes of the Policy. The Panel finds the Complainant has established unregistered trademark and registered trademark rights for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.2.1 and 1.3.

The Panel finds that the Complainant's trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are identical to the Complainant's unregistered and then registered trademark COLDIRETTI for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

It is also well accepted that a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), in this case ".info" and ".biz", is typically ignored when assessing the confusing similarity between a trademark and a domain name. [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.

While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, UDRP panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often-impossible 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 names. 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 present 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.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain names carries a high risk of implied affiliation as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

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.

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, regarding the registration in bad faith of the disputed domain names, the reputation of the Complainant’s trademark COLDIRETTI in Italy (i.e. the country of the Respondent) at the time the disputed domain names were registered is established and the Panel finds that the Respondent more likely than not knew of the Complainant and deliberately registered the disputed domain names due to the likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark.

As regards the use of the disputed domain names, being one “under construction” and the other one inactive, panels 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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant’s trademark in Italy, where the Respondent is purportedly based, the composition of the disputed domain names, identical to the Complainant’s trademark, and the failure of the Respondent to submit a Response or provide any explanation for its motivations in registering 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.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes 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 <coldiretti.biz> and <coldiretti.info> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Edoardo Fano/

Edoardo Fano

Sole Panelist

Date: August 7, 2026