

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Guccio Gucci S.p.A. v. Yashwanth Iyer
Case No. D2026-3355

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Yashwanth Iyer, Ireland, self-represented.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <gucciracing.com> (the first disputed domain name) and <gucciracingalpinef1team.com> (the second disputed domain name) are registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 29, 2026. On July 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 30, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 30, 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 31, 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 August 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 23, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on August 7, 2026. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on July 31, August 3, and August 10, 2026. In his email communication dated August 10, 2026, the Respondent

confirmed that he submitted his complete Response in this case. The Complainant sent email communications to the Center on July 31, August 3, and August 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Mehmet Polat Kalafatoğlu as the sole panelist in this matter on August 12, 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 Guccio Gucci S.p.A., an Italian public limited company that belongs to the international conglomerate company Kering, one of the leading groups worldwide in apparel and accessories. The Gucci Fashion House was founded in 1921 by Guccio Gucci. The Complainant asserts a global portfolio of trademark registrations for the well-known trademark GUCCI, alone and in combination with other word and/or device elements. The Complainant notes that the trademark GUCCI has been regularly used by the Complainant for more than 100 years in connection with products in the high-fashion and leather industry. The Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registrations, among others:

- the International trademark registration for GUCCI, No. 429833, registered on March 30, 1977;
- the International trademark registration for GUCCI, No. 457952, registered on December 16, 1980; and
- the European Union trademark registration for GUCCI, No. 000121988, registered on November 24, 1998.

The Complainant owns the domain name <gucci.com>, registered on June 5, 1996.

On May 27, 2026, the Complainant announced a partnership with the Alpine Formula One Team. From the 2027 FIA Formula One World Championship, the team will race as “Gucci Racing Alpine Formula One Team”. The record shows that this announcement was publicly made through the Complainant’s social media accounts as well as through the Formula One and the Alpine websites. The record also shows that the day before this public announcement, the Complainant filed an Italian trademark application for the GUCCI RACING figurative trademark. This trademark application is currently under examination.

Both disputed domain names were registered on May 27, 2026, which is the same day as the above-mentioned public announcement.

The first disputed domain name initially resolved to a website displaying the title “GUCCI RACING” above the phrase “Luxury Meets Speed” and a contact form (as per the screenshot dated May 27, 2026). The record includes screenshots dated June 4 and July 6, 2026, which show that the first disputed domain name redirected to a Registrar’s page where it was offered for sale. The second disputed domain name initially resolved to a website displaying the title “GUCCI RACING ALPINE F1 TEAM” above the phrase “Luxury Meets Speed” and a contact form (as per the screenshot dated May 28, 2026). A screenshot dated July 6, 2026, shows that the second disputed domain name redirected to a Registrar parking page. At the time of this Decision, they both resolve to Registrar parking pages.

The record also includes pre-Complaint communications in relation to the present case. On May 27, 2026, a web agency entrusted by the Complainant sent a message to the Respondent, inquiring about the first disputed domain name and mentioning the Complainant as a prospective client. The record does not include a reply to this message. On May 28, 2026, the Respondent sent an email communication directly to the Complainant, mentioning their collaboration with Alpine F1 Team, and

noting the following: “I wanted to reach out to see whether there may be any interest in acquiring the following domain names: gucciracing.com gucciracingalpinef1team.com I currently own both domains and would be open to discussing a private sale (...).”

Furthermore, the record shows that after the web agency sent contact requests to the Respondent via the Registrar’s online form, the Respondent replied that both disputed domain names were available for sale and the first disputed domain name had already been listed for sale on a third-party platform. Regarding the asking price, the Respondent stated that the first disputed domain name was listed at “10mil”. For the second disputed domain name, the Respondent did not indicate a price but noted that “a few smaller offers have come in for them”.

Lastly, the record includes a screenshot dated July 28, 2026, which shows that the first disputed domain name was listed for sale on the Registrar’s marketplace for USD 9,999,999.

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 names. First, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the registered trademark GUCCI in which the Complainant has rights. The Complainant submits that the fact that the disputed domain names differ from the Complainant’s trademark by the addition of the generic terms “racing”, “team”, and the third-party trademarks ALPINE and F1 does not affect the confusing similarity. Second, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. Third, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

In his Response dated August 7, 2026, and in other email communications, the Respondent indicated his consent for the transfer of the disputed domain names. For instance, the Respondent noted that he does not contest the Complainant’s claims; he is willing to voluntarily transfer the disputed domain names to the Complainant to resolve the dispute; he is giving away the disputed domain names for free and has no interest in the disputed domain names anymore. However, in his email communication dated August 3, 2026, the Respondent also noted that his “intention was to get the domain and add sporting news to it and use as a blog (which I no longer can do as a sporting fan)”.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Issue: The Respondent’s consent for the transfer of the disputed domain names

As indicated above, the Respondent has submitted its unilateral consent to the remedy requested by the Complainant. In this regard, WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)), section 4.10 states the following:

“How do panels handle cases involving a respondent’s informal or unilateral consent for the transfer of the domain name to the complainant outside the ‘standard settlement process’ described above?

Where parties to a UDRP proceeding have not been able to settle their dispute prior to the issuance of a panel decision using the ‘standard settlement process’ described above, but where the respondent has nevertheless given its consent on the record to the transfer (or cancellation) remedy sought by the complainant, many panels will order the requested remedy solely on the basis of such consent. In

such cases, the panel gives effect to an understood party agreement as to the disposition of their case (whether by virtue of deemed admission, or on a no-fault basis).

In some cases, despite such respondent consent, a panel may in its discretion still find it appropriate to proceed to a substantive decision on the merits. Scenarios in which a panel may find it appropriate to do so include (i) where the panel finds a broader interest in recording a substantive decision on the merits – notably recalling UDRP paragraph 4(b)(ii) discussing a pattern of bad faith conduct, (ii) where while consenting to the requested remedy the respondent has expressly disclaimed any bad faith, (iii) where the complainant has not agreed to accept such consent and has expressed a preference for a recorded decision on the merits, (iv) where there is ambiguity as to the scope of the respondent's consent, or (v) where the panel wishes to be certain that the complainant has shown that it possesses relevant trademark rights."

In the present case, considering [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.10 and particularly, the Respondent's email communication where he noted that his "intention was to get the domain and add sporting news to it and use as a blog", the Panel finds it appropriate to proceed to a substantive decision on the merits, despite the Respondent's consent for the transfer of the disputed domain names.

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 confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain names.

[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 GUCCI is reproduced within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed 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, "racing" on the first disputed domain name, and "racing" and "team" on the second disputed domain name, 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 names and the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Furthermore, the Panel notes that the second disputed domain name also reproduces ALPINE and F1 trademarks belonging to third parties. Following previous panel decisions, the Panel finds that the addition of third-party trademarks does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the second disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.12.

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 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 disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

First, the Panel notes the Complainant’s assertion that the Respondent is not a licensee, authorized agent of the Complainant, or in any other way authorized to use the Complainant’s trademark. Second, the compositions of the disputed domain names, which incorporate the Complainant’s well-known trademark GUCCI, suggest that there is an affiliation with the Complainant when, in fact, there is not one. Furthermore, the Panel notes that in his email communication dated August 3, 2026, the Respondent has merely stated that his “intention was to get the domain and add sporting news to it and use as a blog (which I no longer can do as a sporting fan)”. However, the Respondent has not provided any relevant evidence to support this assertion. On the contrary, the record shows that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names on the same day that the Complainant publicly announced its partnership with the Alpine Formula One Team, and on the day after, the Respondent directly contacted the Complainant and noted that he would be open to discussing a sale of both disputed domain names. In addition, shortly after its registration, the first disputed domain name was listed for sale on the Registrar’s marketplace for USD 9,999,999, and the Respondent’s email communication sent to the web agency shows that both disputed domain names were available for sale. In the Panel’s view, these facts are in direct contradiction with the Respondent’s purported intention to create a sporting news site or a blog. On the contrary, they indicate that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with the intention of selling them to the Complainant, or anyone else interested, at amounts in excess of the out-of-pocket costs. As a result, the Panel finds that the Respondent acted with the intention of capitalizing on the Complainant’s trademark rights and on its recent collaboration with the Alpine Formula One Team.

The fact that the disputed domain names currently resolve to the Registrar’s parked pages does not alter the Panel’s conclusions under this element.

Accordingly, 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.

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 Panel first notes that UDRP panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a well-known trademark, such as GUCCI, by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain names in opportunistic bad faith.

First, considering the date of registration and well-known nature of the GUCCI trademark, the dates of registration and compositions of the disputed domain names, and the Respondent's pre-Complaint email communication to the Complainant mentioned above, the Panel finds it clear that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark rights and its recently announced collaboration with the Alpine Formula One Team. Considering also the Panel's determinations under the second element above, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names in bad faith with the intention of targeting the Complainant's trademark rights.

Second, as noted above and contrary to the Respondent's statement, the Panel finds that the Respondent has used and is using the disputed domain names with the intention of capitalizing on the Complainant's trademark rights. Firstly, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names, which are confusingly similar to the Complainant's well-known trademark, initially resolved to websites displaying the GUCCI trademark, with the titles "GUCCI RACING" and "GUCCI RACING ALPINE F1 TEAM" above the phrase "Luxury Meets Speed", with a contact form and without any disclaimer on the Respondent's lack of relationship with the Complainant. Accordingly, the Panel finds that by using the disputed domain names in this manner, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to his website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark. Secondly, the Respondent's email dated May 28, 2026, shows that both disputed domain names were offered for sale to the Complainant. Moreover, the first disputed domain name redirected to a website where it was listed for sale for the considerable high amount of USD 9,999,999, and the Respondent's email communication sent to the web agency shows that both disputed domain names were available for sale. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent is using the disputed domain names in an attempt to capitalize on the Complainant and its trademark rights or to sell them the Complainant at a considerable amount.

Lastly, the Panel notes that both disputed domain names currently resolve to the Registrar's parked pages. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain names, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the current passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Accordingly, 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 <gucciracingalpinef1team.com> and <gucciracing.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

As noted above, the second disputed domain name <gucciracingalpinef1team.com> also incorporates third-party trademarks. Following established panel practice, the transfer of this disputed domain name shall be ordered without prejudice to the rights of the owners of the trademarks ALPINE and F1 in this disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.13.

/Mehmet Polat Kalafatoğlu/

Mehmet Polat Kalafatoğlu

Sole Panelist

Date: August 12, 2026