ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Guccio Gucci S.p.A. v. ZHULIBIN, ZHULIBIN
Case No. D2026-3182

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is ZHULIBIN, ZHULIBIN, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <guccicore.com> is registered with 22net, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 20, 2026. On July 21, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 22, 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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 11, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Karen Fong as the sole panelist in this matter on August 17, 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, an Italian public limited company, is owned by the international conglomerate, Kering, one of the leading groups worldwide in apparel and accessories. The Complainant's business started with the founding of the Gucci Fashion House by Guccio Gucci in 1921. The Complainant asserts a global portfolio of trade mark registrations for the well-known trade mark GUCCI, alone and in combination with other word and/or device elements. It further asserts that the GUCCI trade mark has been used by the Complainant for more than 100 years in connection with products in the high-fashion and leather industry.

The Complainant's registered trade marks include the following:

- International Trade Mark Registration No. 429833 for GUCCI registered on March 30, 1977;

- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 000121988, for GUCCI registered on November 24, 1998; and

- Chinese Trade Mark Registration No. 177033 for GUCCI registered on May 15, 1983;

(individually and collectively referred to as the "Trade Mark").

The Complainant's main website is at the domain name <gucci.com>, registered on June 5, 1996. It also owns numerous domain names incorporating the Trade Mark.

On May 17, 2026, the Complainant unveiled the "Gucci Core" collection which was conceived as a campaign distilling the essence of Gucci into a new core wardrobe and presenting the Complainant's visual language through a range of timeless and distinctive styles inspired by New York City, the United States of America. The Gucci Core campaign was widely advertised through national and international media, fashion magazines, newspapers, the Gucci website and its official social media accounts.

The Respondent, who appears to be based in China, registered the disputed domain name on May 17, 2026, the same day in which the Complainant launched its international marketing campaign for the "Gucci Core" collection. The disputed domain name is inactive and is directed to an error page. In an email exchange with the Complainant's representatives, the Respondent requested the sum of USD 2,500 to transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant, rejecting an offer to cover his out-of- pocket costs as "[t]he domain has branding value and is related to a globally recognized name". The Complainant's legal representatives then sent a cease and desist letter to the Respondent on May 25, 2026. The Respondent did not respond to the letter and reminder.

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trade Mark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name, and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issue: Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name 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 for the following main reasons:

- The Complainant would be unfairly prejudiced by the time and expense it would take to translate the Complaint and evidence into Chinese when the Respondent is proficient in English as demonstrated in an email exchange between the Respondent and the Complainant's representatives;

- English is one of the primary working languages at WIPO and is the most widely used language in international commercial and intellectual property matters including UDRP proceedings;

- The disputed domain name is registered in Latin characters and includes the English word "core";

- The ".com" Top-Level Domain ("TLD") is an indicator of the Respondent's intention to target an international audience including English speaking users; and

- The Respondent did not respond or make any comment about the content or language of the cease and desist letter sent.

The Respondent has not challenged the Complainant's language request, and in fact has failed to file a response in either English or Chinese despite being duly notified by the Center in both English and Chinese of the language of the proceeding and of the commencement of the proceeding. However, the Panel notes that the Respondent replied in English to the Complainant's representatives' email prior to the Complaint.

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).

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.

6.2 Substantive Issues

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 identity or confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's Trade Mark and the disputed domain name. 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 entirety of the Trade Mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

While the addition of the term "core" after the Trade Mark may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of the word does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

Based on the available record, 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, 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 name. 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 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.

Moreover, the disputed domain name incorporates the Trade Mark in its entirety together with the word "core," and it is this combination - "Gucci Core"- which is the name of the Complainant's new marketing campaign. As a result, the disputed domain name is likely to mislead Internet users into expecting to find the Complainant, as it effectively impersonates the Complainant or suggests an affiliation, sponsorship, or endorsement that does not exist.

Based on the available record, 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 the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent must have been aware of the Trade Mark when registering the disputed domain name given that the disputed domain name was registered on the same day that Complainant launched its "Gucci Core" campaign and the disputed domain name comprises these exact same terms in their entirety. By his own admission, in an email exchange with the Complainant's representatives, the Respondent stated that the disputed domain name was related to a globally recognised brand. This alone demonstrates that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

The disputed domain name is also being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name is being offered for sale by the Respondent for a sum which well exceeds the costs directly related to the registration of the disputed domain name as detailed above. This is evidence that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling as set out in paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

Further, the Panel also notes that the Respondent, as identified by his email address, is the registrant of several domain names which incorporate well-known third party brand owners including McDonald's, Toyota and ChatGPT (e.g. <chatgptgo.cn>, <mcdonaldland.cn>, <toyotaracing.com.cn>). This is a strong indication that the Respondent is a serial cybersquatter and is engaged in a pattern of bad faith conduct which is an example of bad faith contained in paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.2).

The Panel also notes that the disputed domain name is inactive. Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy is non-exhaustive. In assessing bad faith, panels may also consider broader circumstances indicating that the respondent targeted the complainant, including the nature of the disputed domain name and the absence of any credible explanation for its registration. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

In these circumstances, given the above bad faith findings, the fact that the disputed domain name currently resolves to an inactive website does not preclude a finding of bad faith. The Panel therefore concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 <guccicore.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Karen Fong/
Karen Fong
Sole Panelist
Date: September 2, 2026