ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Guccio Gucci S.p.A. v. Theophile Luron
Case No. D2026-3177

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Theophile Luron, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <guccispa.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 20, 2026. On July 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 21, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 22, 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 23, 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 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 19, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Áron László as the sole panelist in this matter on August 31, 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 public limited company headquartered in Florence, Italy, which belongs to the Kering group, an international conglomerate company in the apparel and accessories sector. The Gucci fashion house was founded in 1921. The Complainant was ranked 69th in the 2025 Interbrand “Best Global Brands” list, with a brand value of USD 11.6 billion.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations worldwide for the word mark GUCCI, including, among others:

- International Registration, designating inter alia France, No. 429833 GUCCI (word), registered on March 30, 1977;
- International Registration, designating inter alia France, No. 457952 GUCCI (word), registered on December 16, 1980;
- European Union trademark No. 000121988 for GUCCI (word), registered on November 24, 1998.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <gucci.com>, registered on June 5, 1996, which it uses to promote its brand and offer its products for sale.

The Respondent is Theophile Luron, located in Paris, France, as disclosed by the Registrar in its verification response. The Respondent’s identity was initially concealed behind the privacy service “Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot”.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 19, 2025. It was initially registered through the registrar Realtime Register B.V. and was subsequently transferred to the current Registrar, Dynadot.

Since its registration, the disputed domain name has been redirected to websites offering it for sale. When the Complainant first became aware of the disputed domain name, it resolved to a page on the “www.fruits.co” platform where it was offered for sale for an undisclosed amount. Following its transfer to Dynadot, the disputed domain name was redirected to Dynadot’s “for sale” page, where it was listed at various prices over time, including EUR 25,000, EUR 199,900, and EUR 69,800.

On February 6, 2026, a web agency instructed by the Complainant contacted the Respondent to inquire about the disputed domain name. The Respondent replied from an email address containing his first name, initially quoting a selling price of USD 199,999. After further exchanges, the Respondent increased the asking price to USD 499,999.

On February 19, 2026, the Complainant’s authorised representative sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent via the Registrar and the online contact form available in the WhoIs. A reminder was sent on February 26, 2026.

On March 3, 2026, the Respondent replied from a different email, claiming to have registered the disputed domain name for a project related to spas and wellness that had been abandoned. During a telephone call on March 5, 2026, the Respondent refused to disclose its name but, according to the Complainant, acknowledged awareness of the GUCCI trademark and confirmed having listed the disputed domain name for sale at approximately USD 199,000. In subsequent correspondence, the Respondent offered to transfer the disputed domain name for EUR 25,000.

On March 22, 2026, the Respondent sent an unsolicited communication to the web agency previously instructed by the Complainant, again from the email address containing the Respondent's first name, requesting the Complainant to submit an offer for the disputed domain name.

At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name continued to redirect to Dynadot's marketplace, where it was offered for sale.

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.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its registered and well-known trademark GUCCI, in which it holds rights by virtue of numerous international and European Union trademark registrations predating the registration of the disputed domain name by decades. The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name entirely incorporates its GUCCI trademark, and that the addition of the term "spa" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The Complainant notes that "spa" can be interpreted as the Italian acronym for "Società per Azioni" (joint stock company), which is the Complainant's own corporate form, and that such addition is apt to reinforce, rather than diminish, the association with the Complainant. The Complainant cites several prior UDRP decisions in support, including *Unipol Gruppo S.p.A. and Unipolsai Assicurazioni S.p.A. v. Anonymouse Domains s.r.o.*, WIPO Case No. D2021-2563.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not a licensee, authorised agent, or in any other way authorised to use the Complainant's trademark GUCCI. The Complainant further asserts that it is not aware of any evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by a name corresponding to the disputed domain name. The Complainant submits that the Respondent has not provided any evidence of use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, apart from a purported spa and wellness project which the Respondent claimed to have envisaged and then abandoned, and for which no evidence was provided.

The Complainant highlights that the disputed domain name has been redirected since its registration to websites offering it for sale, and that the Respondent has offered the disputed domain name for sale at amounts significantly exceeding its out-of-pocket costs, which demonstrates the absence of any intention to use the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services or for a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The Complainant further argues that the composition of the disputed domain name, combining the GUCCI trademark with the term "spa", carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant, whether "spa" is interpreted as the Italian corporate designation or as a reference to wellness and spas. The Complainant notes that several other luxury brands operate their own spas, including Dior, Armani and Bulgari, making such an association with the Complainant plausible.

The Complainant also notes that the Respondent is not an employee, licensee, or authorised agent of the Complainant, and that no trademark application or registration for GUCCI could be found in the name of the Respondent in online trademark databases.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant submits that, given the worldwide fame and recognition of the GUCCI trademark, which has been in use since 1921, it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the existence of the Complainant and its trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant cites several prior UDRP decisions recognising the well-known status of the GUCCI mark, including *Guccio Gucci S.p.A. v. Bravia Stoli*, WIPO Case No. D2009-1170.

The Complainant submits that paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy is applicable, as the Respondent registered the disputed domain name for the purpose of selling it to the Complainant for valuable consideration in excess of the documented out-of-pocket costs. The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name has been redirected since its registration to websites where it was offered for sale, which evidences the Respondent's bad faith intent to profit from the sale of the disputed domain name to the Complainant. The Complainant highlights the various prices at which the Respondent offered the disputed domain name for sale, both on public marketplaces and in direct communications with the Complainant's web agency and authorised representative, including USD 199,999, USD 499,999, EUR 25,000, EUR 199,900, and EUR 69,800, all of which far exceed the out-of-pocket costs directly related to the registration and maintenance of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further argues that, by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has also been intentionally attempting to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the associated websites, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Complainant additionally relies on the following as supporting indicators of bad faith: the Respondent's use of a privacy protection service to conceal its identity; the Respondent's provision of incomplete contact details in the WhoIs records, listing an incomplete address; the Respondent's use of an alias and a separate email address to conceal its real identity; and the Respondent's failure to comply with the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter and its continued offering of the disputed domain name for sale even after being formally notified of the infringement.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable".

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that a complainant must prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that a domain name should be cancelled or transferred:

i. the domain name registered by the respondent 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 domain name; and
iii. the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

In view of the Respondent's failure to submit a Response, the Panel shall decide this dispute on the basis of the Complainant's undisputed representations pursuant to paragraphs 5(f), 14(a) and 15(a) of the Rules and draw such inferences as it considers appropriate pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules.

The Panel is entitled to accept all reasonable allegations set forth in a complaint. However, the Panel may deny relief where a complaint contains mere conclusory or unsubstantiated arguments. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.3.

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 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 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, “spa” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name 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.

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.

Apart from a purported spa and wellness project which the Respondent claimed to have envisaged and then abandoned, the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. No evidence of this project was provided. However, the Panel considers that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with 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.

Given the worldwide fame and recognition of the GUCCI trademark, which has been in use since 1921, it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the existence of the Complainant and its trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name for the purpose of selling it to the Complainant for valuable consideration in excess of the documented out-of-pocket costs. Since its registration and until the decision was made, the disputed domain name was redirected to websites where it was offered for sale, which demonstrates the Respondent’s intent to profit from selling the disputed domain name to the Complainant. The Respondent offered the disputed domain name for sale on public marketplaces and in direct communications with the Complainant's web agency and authorised representative at different prices, all of which most likely far exceed the out-of-pocket costs directly related to its registration and maintenance. Therefore, the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in 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 name <guccispa.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Áron László/
Áron László
Sole Panelist
Date: September 14, 2026