

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Namecheap, Inc. v. Fabiano Venturini
Case No. D2026-3347

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Namecheap, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Rome LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Fabiano Venturini, Italy.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <go-namecheap.com> is registered with Register SPA (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 28, 2026. On July 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 30, 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 (Unknown Registrant) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 11, 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 August 20, 2026.

On August 11, 2026, the Center informed the parties in Italian and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is Italian. On August 20, 2026, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding.

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 September 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 23, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Marina Perraki as the sole panelist in this matter on September 28, 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 ICANN-accredited domain name registrar and web-hosting company based in Phoenix, Arizona. It provides domain name registration, domain name search, domain transfer, website hosting, email, and related online services to customers worldwide, and manages over twenty million domain names, continuously using the name NAMECHEAP and NAMECHEAP.COM since 2000.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations, including the United States trademark registration No. 3622358, NAMECHEAP.COM (word), filed on September 26, 2008 and registered on May 19, 2009, for services in international class 42; and the United States trademark registration No. 4213990, NAMECHEAP (word) filed on February 29, 2012 and registered on September 25, 2012, for services in international classes 42, 35, 39 and 45.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 17, 2026, and at the time of filing of the Complaint resolved to a website mimicking that of Complainant (the Website). The Website displayed Complainant's trademark and reproduced: (i) Complainant's tagline "Make more online, for less"; (ii) Complainant's orange-and-gray "N namecheap" logo; (iii) Complainant's hedgehog mascot; (iv) Complainant's blue hero panel and domain-search interface; and (v) Complainant's navigation structure, including the categories "Domains", "Hosting", "Email", "WordPress", and "Security".

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 three elements, which 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 Complainant has rights;
- (ii) 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.

Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Italian. 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 several reasons, including the fact that the disputed domain name is composed entirely of Latin characters and incorporates Complainant's NAMECHEAP mark in its entirety and the Website is entirely in English.

The Respondent did not make any specific submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

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.

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, the word "go" and 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 disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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

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.

Prior to the notice of the dispute, the Respondent did not demonstrate any use of the disputed domain name or a trademark corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

On the contrary, as the Complainant demonstrated, the disputed domain name resolved to the Website, which featured the Complainant’s trademark and suggested falsely that it was that of the Complainant or an affiliated entity or an authorised partner of the Complainant.

Per the Complaint, the Respondent is not an affiliated entity or an authorised distributor or reseller of the Complainant and no agreement, express or otherwise, exists allowing the use of the Complainant’s trademarks on the Website and the use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent.

The Panel also takes into account the nature of the Complainant’s business, which includes search and registration of domain names, and the fact that Complainant maintains its main website under its domain name <namecheap.com>.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here, claimed impersonation, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here, claimed impersonation constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel concludes that Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith. Because the NAMECHEAP mark had been used and registered at the time of the disputed domain name registration by the Respondent, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the Respondent had the Complainant’s marks in mind when registering the disputed domain name (*Tudor Games, Inc. v. Domain*

Hostmaster, Customer ID No. 09382953107339 dba Whois Privacy Services Pty Ltd / Domain Administrator, Vertical Axis Inc., WIPO Case No. [D2014-1754](#); *Parfums Christian Dior v. Javier Garcia Quintas and Christiandior.net*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0226](#)). The Panel also takes into account the content of the Website which mimicked that of the Complainant and the fact that Complainant maintains its main website at "www.namecheap.com".

As regards bad faith use of the disputed domain name, the Complainant has demonstrated that the disputed domain name was used to resolve to the Website, which mimicked that of the Complainant and prominently displayed the Complainant's registered trademarks and Complainant's website content and structure, thereby giving the false impression that it was operated by the Complainant, or a company affiliated to the Complainant or an authorised partner of the Complainant. The disputed domain name was therefore used to intentionally create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks and business as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Website it resolved to. This can be used in support of bad faith registration and use (*Booking.com BV v. Chen Guo Long*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0311](#); *Ebel International Limited v. Alan Brashear*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0001](#); *Walgreen Co. v. Muhammad Azeem / Wang Zheng, Nicenic International Group Co., Limited*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1607](#); *Oculus VR, LLC v. Sean Lin*, WIPO Case No. [DCO2016-0034](#); and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4).

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name 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 name <go-namecheap.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Marina Perraki/

Marina Perraki

Sole Panelist

Date: October 12, 2026