

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

PRADA S.A. v. Vladyslav Klerfon
Case No. D2026-3104

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Vladyslav Klerfon, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <fakepradabag.com>, <fakepradabags.com>, <fake-prada.com>, <fakepradaglasses.com>, <fakepradasunglasses.com>, <pradafake.com>, <pradareplicabag.com>, <pradareplica.com>, <pradareplicasunglasses.com>, <pradasunglassesfake.com>, <pradasunglassesreplica.com>, <replicaprada.com>, and <replicapradasunglasses.com> (the “Domain Names”) are registered with URL Solutions, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 15, 2026. On July 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Names. On July 15, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Names which differed from the named Respondent (Private Whois, GLOBAL DOMAIN PRIVACY SERVICES INC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 17, 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 amendment to the Complaint on July 20, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 July 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Nicholas Smith as the sole panelist in this matter on September 7, 2026.¹ 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 a European company that since 1913 has designed, manufactured, and sold a variety of luxury products, including bags, sunglasses, and other accessories, under the trademark PRADA (the “Prada Mark”). The Complainant operates in 70 countries, has over 17,900 employees, and has developed a significant global reputation in the PRADA Mark.

The Complainant is the owner of trademark registrations in numerous jurisdictions for the PRADA Mark including a United States of America trademark registered on July 8, 1986, for goods in class 25 (registration number 1,400,409).

The Domain Names were registered on April 22, 2026. The Domain Names resolve to websites (the “Respondent’s Websites”) that reproduce the PRADA Mark and images of the Complainant’s products. The Respondent’s Websites each purport to provide information about genuine and counterfeit Prada products and how to distinguish between the two (for example, one website includes the heading “Spot the Difference; Fake Prada Bags Guide”) but each of the Respondent’s Websites also either directly offers unauthorised and/or counterfeit versions (according to the Complaint) of the Complainant’s luxury products, including “Refund and Return Policy” and “Shipping Information” sections, as well information regarding prices and accepted payment methods, or contains links to third-party websites with the same purpose.

The Complainant sent to the Respondent via the privacy email address in the WhoIs records a cease-and-desist letter on May 26, 2026, filed an abuse report with the Registrar on May 27, 2026, and sent a reminder on June 4, 2026, having received no response.

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 Domain Names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

- a) It is the owner of the PRADA Mark, having registered the PRADA Mark in numerous jurisdictions. The Domain Names are each confusingly similar to the PRADA Mark as they wholly reproduce the PRADA Mark and add descriptive terms such as “fake”, “replica”, “glasses”, “sunglasses”, “bag”, and “bags”.
- b) There are no rights or legitimate interests held by the Respondent in respect of the Domain Names. The Respondent is using the Domain Names to create websites for the purpose of linking to third-party websites that sell unauthorised versions of the Complainant’s products or directly offering such products.
- c) The Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith. Given the content of the Respondent’s Websites, which reproduce the Prada Mark and images of the Complainant’s products, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant at the time of registration. The Respondent is using the Domain Names to divert Internet users searching for the Complainant to the Respondent’s Websites and then sometimes to third-party websites for commercial gain. Such conduct amounts to registration and use of the Domain Names in bad faith.

¹The Panel has been appointed following the recusal of the previously appointed panel.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Procedural Considerations

Under paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel is required to ensure that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case, and also that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition.

Since the Respondent's location is stated to be in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision that may affect case notification, it is appropriate for the Panel to consider, in accordance with its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, whether the proceedings should continue.

While it is unclear if the Written Notice was delivered by post to the Respondent, it appears that the Notification of Complaint emails were delivered at the Respondent's email address, as provided by the Respondent to the Registrar.

The Panel concludes that the Parties have been given a fair opportunity to present their case, and decides that the administrative proceedings should continue (see *Netbet Entreprises Ltd v. Privacy Service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf / Vladimir Vladimir, Crowd inc*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1420](#)).

6.2. Substantive Matters

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 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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the Domain Names. Accordingly, the 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, being descriptive terms including "replica", "fake" and "bag", "bags", "glasses", "sunglasses", or a hyphen, 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 Domain Names and the 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 for each of the Domain Names.

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 the Domain Names.

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 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 Domain Names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel considers that the record of this case reflects that:

- before any notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the Respondent did not use, nor has it made demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Names or names corresponding to the Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.2;
- the Respondent (as an individual, business, or other organization) has not been commonly known by the Domain Names. Paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.3;
- the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Names, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue; the Respondent's Websites purportedly offer Prada (or "Prada-inspired") products with "Refund and Return Policy" and "Shipping Information" conditions indicated, as well as prices and accepted payment methods. Paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.4; and
- the record contains no other factors demonstrating rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the Domain Names.

The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way. It has not been authorized by the Complainant to register or use the Domain Names or to seek the registration of any domain name incorporating the PRADA Mark.

The Respondent's Websites are websites that purport to provide general information about legitimate and counterfeit Prada products, but actually operate, in the pretext of informative sites, as a mechanism for selling counterfeit or unauthorised versions of the Complainant's PRADA products.

The Panel has considered, having regard to the principles set out in the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5, whether the use of the Domain Names, such as the Domain Name <fakepradabag.com> to redirect visitors to websites offering counterfeit PRADA products, is fair use, and the Panel is not satisfied that this is the case. Ultimately the commercial use of the Domain Names is in service of infringing the Complainant's PRADA mark. Such illegal activity can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.

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.

The Panel finds that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant at the time the Domain Names were registered, as the Domain Names consist of the distinctive Prada Mark in its entirety plus descriptive terms referring to the types and/or fake or replica nature of the Complainant's products and the Respondent's Websites both refer to the Complainant and offer (either directly or through links to third party sites) unauthorized or counterfeit versions of the Complainant's products in direct competition with the Complainant's products. The registration of the Domain Names in awareness of the Complainant and its rights in the PRADA Mark and in the absence of rights or legitimate interests on the part of the Respondent amounts to registration in bad faith.

The Domain Names have been used by the Respondent to offer counterfeit or unauthorized Prada products in competition with the Complainant (either directly or through third party sites). Consequently, the Respondent registered and is using the Domain Names to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the PRADA Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its websites. The overall circumstances of this case point to the Respondent's bad faith and the mere existence of a "disclaimer" or claims – which to be clear, come off as pretextual – that the sites are editorial/informative cannot cure such bad faith.

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 <fakepradabag.com>, <fakepradabags.com>, <fake-prada.com>, <fakepradaglasses.com>, <fakepradasunglasses.com>, <pradafake.com>, <pradareplicabag.com>, <pradareplica.com>, <pradareplicasunglasses.com>, <pradasunglassesfake.com>, <pradasunglassesreplica.com>, <replicaprada.com>, and <replicapradasunglasses.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nicholas Smith/

Nicholas Smith

Sole Panelist

Date: September 8, 2026