

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Antonio Lupi Design S.p.A. v. Unafe Mavir
Case No. D2026-3467

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Antonio Lupi Design S.p.A., Italy, represented by Società Italiana Brevetti S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is Unafe Mavir, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <antoniolupit.sbs> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 5, 2026. On August 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 7, 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 (Dynadot Privacy Service, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 7, 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 7, 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 11, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 31, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 1, 2026.

The Center appointed C. K. Kwong as the sole panelist in this matter on September 16, 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 the registered owner of trademarks consisting of or embodying the words “antonio lupi”, as claimed in the amended Complaint and referred to in Annexes 13 and 14 of the amended Complaint. These include the following registrations for ANTONIO LUPI:

Country/Region	Registration No.	International Classification of goods/services
European Union	Registration No. 001632264 registered on May 28, 2001	11, 20 and 21
International	Registration No. 745251 registered on September 19, 2000	11, 20 and 21
Italy	Registration No. 0000823601 registered on September 19, 2000	6, 11, 19, 20 and 21

The Complainant is a company established in Italy and founded by Mr. Antonio Lupi. Its high-quality products bearing the trademark ANTONIO LUPI, especially bathroom furniture, have become internationally known and available beyond Italy to many other countries in Europe, North America, Asia, South America and Africa.

The Complainant has also registered over 30 domain names embodying the words “antonio lupi” with the earliest one dating back to 1999. The Complainant operates an official website using the domain name <antoniolupi.it> (Annex 11 to the amended Complaint) since 1999.

The uncontradicted evidence produced by the Complainant shows that the use and registration of its ANTONIO LUPI mark occurred well before the registration of the disputed domain name <antoniolupit.sbs> on June 29, 2026. The disputed domain name resolved to a website at which the Complainant’s trademarks are reproduced and which redirects the users to the Complainant’s official website at <antoniolupi.it>.

Other than the particulars shown in the printout of the database searches conducted by the Complainant on the publicly available Whois (as provided in Annex 1 to the amended Complaint), the information disclosed by the Registrar, and the website pages as shown in the amended Complaint, there is no information concerning the background, businesses or activities of the Respondent.

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 has rights in the ANTONIO LUPI mark. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s registered ANTONIO LUPI trademark, incorporating the ANTONIO LUPI trademark in its entirety and adding to it only the single letter “t” immediately at the end and the generic Top-Level-Domain (“gTLD”) “.sbs”.

The Respondent has not registered or applied for any trademark for ANTONIO LUPI, whether written as one word or two words.

No license or authorization has been given by the Complainant to the Respondent, to use the trademark ANTONIO LUPI or to use or register and/or use the disputed domain name <antoniolupit.sbs>. The Respondent has no relationship with the Complainant.

The Respondent was not making a bona fide offering of services or legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has used the Complainant's trademark ANTONIO LUPI on the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, and also redirected users to the Complainant's official website at "www.antoniolupi.it". The Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant's trademark ANTONIO LUPI and is using the disputed domain name which is almost identical to the Complainant's trademark in order to mislead Internet users to access the Respondent's website for commercial gains.

The Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant's trademark ANTONIO LUPI as such mark has been widely used and registered well before the registration of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Having considered the records in the case file, the Panel is satisfied that the Center has discharged its responsibility under paragraph 2(a) of the Rules to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to the Respondent of the Complaint.

In rendering its Decision, the Panel must adjudicate the dispute in accordance with paragraph 15(a) of the Rules which provides that, "[t]he Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable". Paragraph 14(b) of the Rules further provides that, "[i]f a Party, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, does not comply with any provision of, or requirement under, these Rules or any requests from the Panel, the Panel shall draw such inferences therefrom as it considers appropriate". The three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are considered below.

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant, being the registered owner of the trademarks listed under Section 4 above, has successfully shown rights in respect of the trademark ANTONIO LUPI for the purposes of the Policy.

The entirety of the mark ANTONIO LUPI is reproduced within the disputed domain name, with the addition of a "t". Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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.

There is no legitimate explanation on the record as to why the Respondent adopted the terms “antoniolupi” or “antoniolupit” in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has also confirmed that it has not licensed or authorized the Respondent to use its trademark ANTONIO LUPI in the disputed domain name.

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.

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 Complainant has used and registered its ANTONIO LUPI trademark as detailed in Section 4 above for over 25 years before the registration of the disputed domain name by the Respondent in 2026.

The website to which the disputed domain name resolves, uses the Complainant’s mark ANTONIO LUPI and redirects the user to the Complainant’s official website. These clearly prove the Respondent’s knowledge of the Complainant’s trademark ANTONIO LUPI at the time of registration of the disputed domain name and bad faith use.

The redirection of the disputed domain name to the Complainant’s official website supports registration in bad faith ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4), reinforcing the likelihood of confusion, as Internet users are likely to consider the disputed domain name as in some way endorsed by or connected with the Complainant. This establishes bad faith as the Respondent retains control over the redirection, thus creating an implied ongoing threat to the Complainant as to whatever use the disputed domain name could be put at, considering its confusingly similar nature (*Ann Summers Limited v. Domains By Proxy, LLC / Mingchun Chen*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-0625](#)).

By reason of the above and the incorporation of the unique ANTONIO LUPI trademark entirely letter by letter as part of the disputed domain name, along with a “t” reinforcing the similarity with the Complainant’s own domain name <antoniolupi.it>, without any explanation and the Complainant’s prior substantial use of the ANTONIO LUPI mark, the Panel concludes that the Respondent must have been aware of the existence of the Complainant and its trademark ANTONIO LUPI at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 <antoniolupit.sbs> be transferred to the Complainant.

/C. K. Kwong/

C. K. Kwong

Sole Panelist

Date: September 30, 2026