

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ZAMBON S.p.A. v. Yiwei Ren, Yiwei

Case No. D2026-2733

1. The Parties

The Complainant is ZAMBON S.p.A., Italy, represented by Studio Barbero S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is Yiwei Ren, Yiwei, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <zambon.site> is registered with Atak Domain Hosting Internet ve Bilgi Teknolojileri Limited Sirketi d/b/a Atak Teknoloji (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 23, 2026. On June 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 25, 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 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 August 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Marina Perraki as the sole panelist in this matter on August 6, 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 pharmaceutical company active since 1906 and currently operating in Europe, North and South America and Asia, with nearly three thousand employees throughout the world and products plants in Italy, Brazil, Switzerland, France and China.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations worldwide for ZAMBON, including the International Trademark Registration No. 509634, ZAMBON (word), registered on January 26, 1987, for goods in international class 5.

The Complainant is also the owner of domain name registrations for ZAMBON, including <zambon.com>, registered on December 6, 1999.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 22, 2025, and redirects to a GoDaddy landing website where it is being offered for sale for USD 1,450 or lease for USD 182 per month.

The Complainant sent a Cease-and-Desist letter to the Respondent on October 29, 2025, and May 13, 2026, to which Respondent did not reply.

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.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists the three elements which the Complainant must satisfy with respect to the disputed domain name:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (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 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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.site” is disregarded, as gTLDs typically do not form part of the comparison on the grounds that they are required for technical reasons (*Rexel Developpements SAS v. Zhan Yequn*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0275](#); and *Hay & Robertson International Licensing AG v. C. J. Lovik*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0122](#)).

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.

On the record, the disputed domain name leads to a GoDaddy webpage, where it is being offered for sale / lease for an amount that seemingly exceeds out-of-pocket expenses and there is no reasonable explanation as to the registration and holding of the disputed domain name that could lead the Panel to a conclusion different to the Respondent targeting the Complainant through the disputed domain name. The Panel also notes the composition of the disputed domain name which reproduces the Complainant’s mark in its entirety.

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.

Because the Complainant’s mark had been used and registered by the Complainant long before the registration of the disputed domain name, it is most likely that the Respondent had the Complainant’s mark in mind when registering the disputed domain name.

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.

The disputed domain name is being offered for sale / lease. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the composition of the disputed domain name, which reproduces the Complainant's mark in its entirety and also the reputation of the Complainant's mark, and the fact that the Respondent has failed to file a Response and to reply to the Cease-and-Desist letters of the Complainant and finds that in the circumstances of this case, it is more likely than not that the Respondent meant to register the disputed domain name for the purpose of selling the disputed domain name to the Complainant or to a competitor of the Complainant, for valuable consideration possibly in excess of any out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name. Therefore, the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Last, as the Complainant demonstrated, the Respondent has a pattern of bad faith conduct with more than 15 cases of prior domain name registrations targeting third-party trademarks, which is a further indication of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.2.

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 <zambon.site> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Marina Perraki/

Marina Perraki

Sole Panelist

Date: August 20, 2026