

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Strasshill Holdings Limited v. Weadom LTD, Weadom
Case No. D2026-3358

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Strasshill Holdings Limited, Cyprus, represented by MSA IP – Milojevic Sekulic & Associates, Serbia.

The Respondent is Weadom LTD, Weadom, United Kingdom ("UK").

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <bakecaaincontrii.com>, <bakeca.social>, and <bakecasocial.com> are registered with Global Domain Group 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 31, 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 (Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Global Domain Group, Global Domain Group Privacy Service / Michael Foster, Bakeca Social) and contact information in the Complaint. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on July 31, 2026. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 5, 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 10, 2026.

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 August 14, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on September 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 3, 2026. The Respondent requested the automatic four-day extension

pursuant to paragraph 5(b) of the Rules, and the due date for Response was extended to September 7, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on September 6, 2026.

The Center appointed Tommaso La Scala as the sole panelist in this matter on September 15, 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 Strasshill Holdings Limited, a Cyprus-based technology company active in design and development of mobile and desktop platforms.

The Complainant affirms it is providing online classified advertising services under the BAKECA INCONTRI mark since 2005; since 2010, personal advertisement services have been offered through the Complainant's website "www.bakecaincontrii.com", where the latter currently operates online bulletin boards and dating and escort advertising services, mostly directed to the Italian public.

The Complainant owns several trademark registrations, inter alia:

- European Union Trade Mark("EUTM") registration No. 012610234 BAKECA INCONTRI (word), registered on July 9, 2014 for classes 35, 38, 42, and 45;
- EUTM registration No. 012665451 BAKEKA INCONTRI (figurative), registered on July 24, 2014 for classes 35, 38, 42, and 45; and
- EUTM registration No. 013976741 BAKEKA (word), registered on August 17, 2015 for classes 35, 38, 42, and 45.

The Complainant's figurative mark is reproduced as follows:



The disputed domain name <bakecaaincontrii.com> was registered on October 19, 2014, while the disputed domain names <bakecasocial.com> and <bakeca.social> were registered on March 9, 2023, and December 6, 2023, respectively.

The Respondent is Weadom LTD, a UK-based company.

The Respondent operates at "www.bakecasocial.com" an Italian-language adult social network under the "BakecaSocial" name, described as "the Italian social network for adults". The platform includes, among others, a section named "Annunci" (ads), a marketplace, private messaging, and content monetization features. According to the Respondent, such platform counted more than 37,000 registered users as of September 2, 2026.

At the time of filing of the Complaint, <bakecasocial.com> resolved, and <bakeca.social> redirected, to the Respondent's website at "www.bakecasocial.com", while <bakecaaincontrii.com> redirected Internet users to the "Annunci" section of the same website, at "www.bakecasocial.com/annunci". The following logo was featured in the top-left corner of the page:



According to the Complainant, the page "www.bakecasocial.com/blogs" also contained a banner referring to <bakecaaincontrii.com>.

A Wayback Machine capture of May 20, 2022, produced by the Respondent, shows that the support page of the website at <bakecaaincontrii.com> stated, in Italian, that the website had “nothing to do with” the advertising website “bakecaincontrii.com” and that the two were “distinct and separate realities”. A capture of March 22, 2023 of the support page at the domain name <bakecasocial.com> contains a similar statement.

The disputed domain names <bakecaaincontrii.com> and <bakecasocial.com> have been offered for sale on the Sedo platform at the price of EUR 15,000 each.

Before filing the Complaint, the Complainant sent takedown notices to the Registrar and hosting provider of <bakecasocial.com> in December 2024 and June 2025, and of <bakecaaincontrii.com> in June and August 2025. The Respondent replied to such notices, denying any infringement.

It appears from the copies of the Parties’ exchanges provided, that on August 15, 2026, the Respondent offered to transfer the domain name <bakecaaincontrii.com> to the Complainant, without admission of liability, on the condition that the proceedings be terminated in respect of <bakecasocial.com> and <bakeca.social>, which would remain with the Respondent. The Respondent further offered to modify the logo, the colour palette and certain graphical elements of the BakecaSocial platform. The Complainant replied with a counterproposal, which the Respondent did not accept.

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

(a) the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s BAKECA INCONTRI and BAKEKA trademarks;

(b) the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, as it is not affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant, it is not commonly known by the disputed domain names, it is a dormant company according to its filings with the UK Companies House, and it uses the disputed domain names for a website offering services similar to those of the Complainant and displaying a logo mimicking the Complainant’s registered logo; the Complainant further submits that the Respondent may be collecting visitors’ personal data or conducting phishing or other fraudulent activities;

(c) the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith, as it could not have been unaware of the Complainant and its trademarks, which predate the registration of the disputed domain names; the Respondent uses the disputed domain names to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademarks; two of the disputed domain names are offered for sale at EUR 15,000 each; and the Respondent used a privacy service to conceal its identity.

B. Respondent

On the other hand, the Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names, and requests that each of the disputed domain names be assessed separately.

In particular the Respondent:

(a) acknowledges that <bakecaaincontrii.com> is lexically close to the BAKECA INCONTRI trademark and to the Complainant's primary domain name, while noting that the BAKEKA trademark was registered after the creation of <bakecaaincontrii.com>;

(b) contends that it has rights or legitimate interests in <bakecasocial.com> and <bakeca.social>, which are used for "BakecaSocial", a genuine and operating social network with a substantial user community; that the name "BakecaSocial" has an independent rationale, since "bakeca" evokes the Italian word "bacheca" (notice board, or the "wall" of a social network) and "social" describes the nature of the service; that it is commonly known by the name BakecaSocial; and that its websites have contained, since 2022 and 2023, express statements of non-affiliation with the Complainant;

(c) contends that bad faith must be assessed for each disputed domain name at the date of its registration or acquisition by the Respondent; that the redirection of <bakecaaincontrii.com>, the banner on its website and the later Sedo listings do not prove its intent at the time of registration of the other disputed domain names; that the Complainant's evidence of reputation (a traffic figure of 2026) cannot be projected backwards; that an offer for sale does not by itself show that a domain name was registered primarily for sale to the Complainant; and that the use of a privacy service, the dormant-company filings, and the registered-office address do not show bad faith, the Respondent having always been identifiable and contactable;

(d) rejects the allegations of impersonation, phishing, fraud and unlawful collection of personal data as speculative and unsupported by any evidence, and while acknowledging that certain historical colours of the Parties' logos were similar, it denies any deliberate copying; and

(e) requests the Panel to consider whether the Complaint constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding under paragraph 15(e) of the Rules.

6. Discussion and Findings

Considering the Registrar has confirmed that all the disputed domain names are registered in the name of the same registrant, the Complaint may relate to all of them in accordance with paragraph 3(c) of the Rules. It is therefore unnecessary for the Panel to address the Complainant's arguments on common control, which are relevant where a complaint is filed against multiple registrants. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.11.2.

The Panel agrees with the Respondent that each disputed domain name must be assessed on its own merits under each element of the Policy; however, this does not preclude the Panel from drawing certain reasonable inferences from the totality of the circumstances, including the Respondent's conduct in relation to one of the disputed domain names when assessing its intent in respect of the others, especially where – as in the present case – all the disputed domain names are held by the same person, are used in connection with the same website, and are functionally interconnected.

The Respondent sent to the Center its communication of September 2, 2026, consisting of the settlement correspondence exchanged by the Parties, and both Parties have referred to such correspondence in the proceedings. The Response itself refers to the Respondent's willingness to further differentiate the visual presentation of its platform.

Panels have accepted that statements made in the context of settlement discussions may be taken into account where relevant to the issues to be decided. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.10. The Panel has considered such correspondence only to the limited extent discussed below.

The Respondent's offer to transfer <bakecaaincontrii.com> was conditional upon the termination of these proceedings in respect of the other disputed domain names and was not accepted by the Complainant; in its Response, the Respondent requests the denial of the Complaint in its entirety.

As a consequence, the Panel will decide this case on the merits in respect of all the disputed domain names.

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 Respondent does not dispute the Complainant's rights in the BAKECA INCONTRI and BAKEKA trademarks.

The disputed domain name <bakecaaincontrii.com> reproduces the BAKECA INCONTRI trademark with the mere duplication of the final letter "a" of "bakeca" and of the final letter "i" of "incontri". A domain name which consists of an obvious or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9. The Respondent even itself acknowledges that this disputed domain name is lexically close to the Complainant's trademark.

The disputed domain names <bakecasocial.com> and <bakeca.social> incorporate the term "bakeca", which is the first and dominant element of the BAKECA INCONTRI trademark.

The Panel therefore finds the Complainant's marks are recognizable within these disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. Although the addition of other terms, here "social", 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 <bakecasocial.com> and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The generic Top-Level Domains ".com" and ".social" are viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such are disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Lastly, the fact that the BAKEKA trademark was registered after the creation of <bakecaaincontrii.com> is not relevant under the first element, although it may bear on the assessment of the third element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.1.3.

Accordingly, the Panel finds the disputed domain names to be confusingly similar to the trademarks in which the Complainant has rights, and that 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.

This Panel finds that the Complainant has made a prima facie case that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondent has no connection to or affiliation with the Complainant, and the Complainant has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use or register any domain name incorporating the Complainant's trademarks. The burden of production has therefore shifted to the Respondent, which has filed a Response and evidence that the Panel has carefully considered, separately for each disputed domain name.

As regards <bakecaaincontrii.com>, the Respondent has not put forward any meaningful argument in support of its rights or legitimate interests: by its own admission, such disputed domain name has "principally been used as a redirection mechanism", and the record shows that it redirects Internet users to the "Annunci" (ads) section of the Respondent's website, i.e., to services wholly overlapping with the Complainant's core advertising services.

It is well established by relevant UDRP decisions that use of a domain name consisting of a misspelling of a complainant's trademark and of its primary domain name to divert Internet users to the respondent's own competing services cannot confer rights or legitimate interests on the respondent. Moreover, the composition of this disputed domain name, which is a typosquatting variation of the Complainant's trademark and primary domain name, coupled with its use to redirect to a website offering services competing with the Complainant's core services, reflects the Respondent's ultimate intent to confuse unsuspecting Internet users seeking or expecting the Complainant.

As regards <bakecasocial.com> and <bakeca.social> domain names, the Respondent relies on the actual operation of the BakecaSocial platform, which has been publicly available under the BakecaSocial name since shortly after the registration of <bakecasocial.com>. As to the size of its user base, the Respondent has produced a screenshot of its own administrative dashboard, reporting more than 37,000 registered users as of September 2, 2026: such data is generated by the Respondent itself and is not corroborated by any independent evidence/third-party, so the Panel is not in a position to verify its accuracy.

In any event, the Panel does not question that the Respondent's platform is a real and operating website, as also shown by the Wayback Machine captures and the screenshots on record, and not a mere pretext created to justify the registration of the disputed domain names.

The matter here is that the existence of an actual business does not in itself suffice: under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, the offering of goods or services must be bona fide. The use of a domain name that was chosen to take unfair advantage of a complainant's trademark, by attracting Internet users familiar with such trademark to a competing offering, cannot be considered bona fide, regardless of the scale of the respondent's business. As discussed in further detail under the third element, the Panel finds that the Respondent (which was aware of the Complainant and its trademarks), adopted the element of the Complainant's trademark "bakeca" in the disputed domain names and incorporated the Complainant's BAKEKA trademark in its logo with the same font and colour as that used by the Complainant, for an Italian adult-oriented platform operating in the very same market segment as the Complainant, and used the typosquatting domain name <bakecaaincontrii.com> to channel Internet traffic to that platform.

The Respondent's explanation that "bakeca" evokes the Italian word "bacheca" does not persuade the Panel: the Italian dictionary word is "bacheca", which may well be evocative of a notice board and therefore of limited distinctiveness, whereas "bakeca" is a stylized misspelling of such word and "bakeca incontrii" as combined corresponds exactly to the Complainant's trademark, used by the Complainant since well before the registration of the disputed domain names, in the very sector in which the Respondent operates. The Respondent has not explained why, among the many possible ways to evoke a "notice board" for an Italian adult social network, it chose precisely the Complainant's spelling and the strikingly similar visual presentation.

Nor can the Respondent claim to be commonly known by the disputed domain names under paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. The Respondent is Weadom LTD, and "BakecaSocial" is the name of its platform, which, in light of the above, was itself derived from the Complainant's trademark. A respondent

cannot derive rights or legitimate interests from being known by a name that was adopted to take unfair advantage of the complainant's trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.3.

The Respondent's use does not qualify as legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy either, since the Respondent's platform is commercial in nature, offering paid subscriptions and content monetization features. The non-affiliation statements published on the Respondent's websites do not alter the above findings (see further below under the third element).

For the sake of completeness, the Panel notes that the Complainant's allegations that the Respondent may be collecting visitors' personal data or conducting phishing or other fraudulent activities are not supported by any evidence and are expressed by the Complainant itself in hypothetical terms. Panels are generally not prepared to accept merely conclusory or wholly unsupported allegations of illegal activity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.2. The Panel has therefore disregarded such allegations, which are in any event not necessary to the Panel's findings.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that 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.

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.

As to the relevant dates, the BAKECA INCONTRI trademark was registered in July 2014, before the creation of <bakecaaincontrii.com> on October 19, 2014, and all the Complainant's trademarks predate the registration of <bakecasocial.com> and <bakeca.social> in 2023. The Respondent has stated that it "acquired" <bakecaaincontrii.com>, without indicating the date of such acquisition. Where a domain name is acquired by a respondent, the relevant date for the assessment of bad faith is the date on which the respondent acquired it. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.9. In any event, whether the Respondent registered or subsequently acquired this disputed domain name, the Complainant's BAKECA INCONTRI trademark predates the Respondent's registration. The Respondent, which is the only party in a position to know the date of acquisition, has not disclosed it. The Respondent's argument based on section 3.8.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) does not therefore assist it.

As to the Respondent's knowledge of the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant and its trademarks at the time it registered the disputed domain names. Further, the Respondent itself has produced a Wayback Machine capture dated May 20, 2022 of the support page of the website at <bakecaaincontrii.com>, stating that such website had "nothing to do with" the Complainant's advertising website at "bakecaincontrii.com". The capture of March 22, 2023 of the BakecaSocial support page, taken only days after the registration of <bakecasocial.com>, contains a similar statement. Far from supporting the Respondent's good faith, these statements demonstrate that the Respondent had the Complainant in mind before registering <bakecasocial.com> and <bakeca.social>. By the Respondent's own account, such statements were published "to correct misdirected inquiries", which indicates that Internet users were in fact confused. Panels have held that a disclaimer does not cure bad faith where the overall circumstances of the case indicate that the respondent's intent was to target the complainant's trademark; to the contrary, it may be regarded as an admission by the respondent that users may be confused. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.7.

The disputed domain name <bakecaaincontrii.com> is a typosquatting variation of the Complainant's BAKECA INCONTRI trademark and of the Complainant's primary domain name <bakecaincontrii.com>, which it reproduces with the addition of a single letter. The Respondent has not provided any plausible explanation for the registration or acquisition of this disputed domain name other than to trade off the Complainant's rights, and the Panel finds none. By the Respondent's own admission, the disputed domain name has been used principally as a redirection mechanism, and it currently redirects Internet users to the ads section of the Respondent's platform, offering adult-oriented services overlapping with those of the Complainant. In the Panel's view, by using this disputed domain name the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4. The Respondent's own statement, in the settlement correspondence, that this is the disputed domain name "most capable of potentially giving rise to user confusion" further supports such finding.

As regards <bakecasocial.com> and <bakeca.social>, the Panel has carefully considered the Respondent's argument that the evidence concerning <bakecaaincontrii.com> cannot be automatically transposed to these disputed domain names.

The Panel agrees that each disputed domain name must be assessed on its own merits; however, the assessment of the Respondent's intent at the time of registration of these disputed domain names must take into account the totality of the circumstances of the case, including any respondent pattern of targeting complainant's marks. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the following circumstances, taken together, lead the Panel to conclude that, on the balance of probabilities, the Respondent registered <bakecasocial.com> and <bakeca.social> domain names with the Complainant and its trademarks in mind, and with the intention of taking unfair advantage of them:

- (i) at the time of registration of these disputed domain names, the Respondent was aware of the Complainant, its services and its trademarks, as shown by the non-affiliation statement published by the Respondent on the website at <bakecaaincontrii.com> since at least May 2022;
- (ii) these disputed domain names incorporate the term "bakeca", which is the distinctive element of the Complainant's BAKECA INCONTRI trademark and is phonetically identical to the BAKEKA trademark; as discussed above, the Respondent has not provided a credible explanation for the adoption of this unusual spelling – which corresponds to the Complainant's trademark – of the Italian word "bacheca";
- (iii) the Respondent uses these disputed domain names for an Italian-language adult platform, including an "Annunci" (ads) section, in the same market segment in which the Complainant has been operating under its trademarks for many years; the addition of the term "social" does not dispel, and may rather reinforce, the association with the Complainant, given the social and dating-related nature of the Complainant's services;
- (iv) the Respondent has integrated these disputed domain names with <bakecaaincontrii.com>, which it has used to channel to its BakecaSocial platform the Internet traffic generated by users looking for the Complainant's website; and
- (v) it appears evident, on the basis of the comparison produced by the Complainant and reproduced above, that there is a high degree of similarity between the Complainant's earlier registered figurative trademark (EUTM No. 012665451) and the logo subsequently adopted by the Respondent; the Respondent's logo incorporates the "bakeka" spelling which is identical to the Complainant's BAKEKA trademark; and the Respondent itself has acknowledged that certain elements of the colour palette of its logo were similar to those of the Complainant's logo, and has offered to modify its logo, colour palette and graphical elements in order to eliminate any perception of visual association between the Parties.

In light of the above, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of these disputed domain names also fall within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The fact that the BakecaSocial platform would have developed a substantial user base does not alter this finding: it shows, at most, that the Respondent's business has been commercially successful, but not that the disputed domain names were registered and used in good faith.

Nor does the Panel find persuasive the Respondent's argument that the present dispute concerns broader trademark infringement or unfair competition issues falling outside the scope of the Policy. The evidence on file convincingly establishes that the Respondent targeted the Complainant's trademarks in the registration and use of the disputed domain names, which is precisely the conduct that the Policy is designed to address.

Having found bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, the Panel does not need to rely on the other circumstances alleged by the Complainant. In particular, the Panel notes that: (i) the record does not demonstrate that the disputed domain names were registered primarily for the purpose of selling them to the Complainant or to a competitor within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy, although the offer for sale of two of the disputed domain names at a price seemingly well in excess of the out-of-pocket costs in the face of a supposed willingness to settle is not inconsistent with such a finding ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.1); (ii) the use of a privacy service is not, in the circumstances of this case, indicative of bad faith, since the Respondent was identifiable through its website and replied to the communications received ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.6); and (iii) the Respondent's dormant-company filings and registered office address are not directly relevant to the assessment of bad faith. As already noted, the Complainant's allegations of phishing and fraud are unsupported and have been disregarded.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

D. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking

The Respondent has requested the Panel to consider whether the Complaint constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding. Paragraph 15(e) of the Rules provides that, if after considering the submissions, the Panel finds that the Complaint was brought in bad faith, for example in an attempt at Reverse Domain Name Hijacking or to harass the domain-name holder, the Panel shall declare in its decision that the Complaint was brought in bad faith and constitutes an abuse of the administrative proceeding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.16.

Given that the Complaint has succeeded in respect of all the disputed domain names, there is no basis for a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking. While the Panel has disregarded certain unsupported allegations made by the Complainant, these do not amount to bad faith in bringing the Complaint which is otherwise well founded. The Respondent's request is therefore denied.

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 <bakecaaincontrii.com>, <bakeca.social>, and <bakecasocial.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Tommaso La Scala/

Tommaso La Scala

Sole Panelist

Date: September 29, 2026