

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Barilla G. e R. Fratelli S.p.A. v. Dynadot Privacy Service
Case No. D2026-3492

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Barilla G. e R. Fratelli S.p.A., Italy, represented by Studio Barbero S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is Dynadot Privacy Service, United States of America ("United States" or "US").

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <barillafiber.com>, <barillafibersuper.com>, <barillafiberultra.com>, <barillaproteinsuper.com>, and <barillaproteinultra.com> are registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 6, 2026. On August 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On August 12, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, Dynadot, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 12, 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 August 12, 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 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 2, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 3, 2026.

The Center appointed Daniel Peña as the sole panelist in this matter on September 8, 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 Italian food company established in Parma in 1877. The BARILLA group, which the Complainant is a part of, is operating directly in 28 countries, exporting to more than 100 countries, employing nearly 9,000 people, and reporting 2025 turnover of EUR 4.837 billion.

The Complainant's group is the number one of the top Italian food groups, a leading global pasta brand and is promoted through the Complainant's websites, social-media presence, advertising, sales, and distribution activities.

The Complainant relies principally on its longstanding BARILLA registrations and also on its registered BARILLA PROTEIN PLUS and BARILLA PROTEIN+ marks.

The principal registered rights are as follows:

- BARILLA (logo), International Trademark No. 349555, registered on September 26, 1968 in classes 5, 30;
- BARILLA (logo), International Trademark No. 517379, registered on December 2, 1987 in classes 21, 25, 29, 30, 31;
- BARILLA, International Trademark No. 675652 June 20, 1997 in classes 29, 30;
- BARILLA, International Trademark No. 1077405, registered on April 7, 2011 in classes 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 41, 42, 43;
- BARILLA, European Union Trade Mark No. 008585747, filed September 30, 2009; registered February 22, 2010, in classes 5, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 43;
- BARILLA, US Trademark No. 2005752 filed May 22, 1995; registered October 8, 1996, in class 30;
- BARILLA (logo), US Trademark No. 2657872 filed July 21, 2000; registered December 10, 2002, in class 30;
- BARILLA, International Trademark No. 1749115 May 17, 2023, in classes 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 41, 43;
- BARILLA PROTEINPLUS, European Union Trade Mark No. 019093971 filed October 21, 2024; registered March 18, 2025, in classes 29, 30, 43;
- BARILLA PROTEIN+, European Union Trade Mark No. 019093973 Filed October 21, 2024; registered March 18, 2025, in classes 29, 30, 43.

The Complainant also filed European Union trade mark applications on June 5, 2026 for BARILLA FIBER, BARILLA FIBER SUPER, BARILLA FIBER ULTRA, BARILLA PROTEIN SUPER, and BARILLA PROTEIN ULTRA. Those applications are relevant to the timing and targeting evidence under the third element of the Policy, but the first element of the Policy is determined here on the basis of the Complainant's established registered rights.

The disputed domain names were registered on June 9, 2026, four days after the Complainant filed five European Union trade mark applications. On June 10, 2026, they resolved to Atom.com marketplace pages offering each for sale at USD 1,999. Atom.com removed the listings on June 16, 2026, following the Complainant's request. On June 30, 2026, the disputed domain names appeared on the GoDaddy marketplace at the same price, and were delisted after the Complainant's IP claim.

After the Atom.com delisting, the disputed domain names resolved to pay-per-click parking pages. On June 30, 2026, the Complainant requested deactivation, and on July 2, 2026, the provider confirmed parking content had been blocked. The current use is inactive, following prior sale listings and pay-per-click parking.

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 asserts rights in the BARILLA trademark through longstanding registrations and extensive use since 1877, establishing BARILLA as a famous mark in the international food sector.

On the first element, the Complainant submits that each disputed domain name incorporates BARILLA in full, with additions such as "fiber", "protein", "super", and "ultra" insufficient to avoid confusing similarity. It notes that the disputed domain names <barillaproteinsuper.com> and <barillaproteinultra.com> closely resemble its BARILLA PROTEINPLUS and BARILLA PROTEIN+ marks, with "super" and "ultra" substituting for "plus". The ".com" generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") is disregarded.

On the second element, the Complainant contends that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, being neither authorized nor commonly known by the disputed domain names, and having made no bona fide or fair use. Instead, the disputed domain names were listed for sale at USD 1,999 each, far above registration costs, and later used for pay-per-click parking. Inactive status does not establish legitimacy. The use of a privacy service and failure to respond to cease-and-desist letters further support the absence of rights or legitimate interests.

On bad faith, the Complainant submits that the Respondent could not have been unaware of the famous BARILLA mark. The registrations followed closely after the Complainant's European Union filings for BARILLA FIBER and BARILLA PROTEIN variants (BARILLA FIBER, BARILLA FIBER SUPER, BARILLA FIBER ULTRA, BARILLA PROTEIN SUPER, and BARILLA PROTEIN ULTRA). The Complainant invokes paragraph 4(b)(i) (intent to sell for profit), 4(b)(ii) (pattern of blocking), and 4(b)(iv) (commercial exploitation through confusion). Inactive status does not negate bad faith given the totality of circumstances: fame of the mark, lack of rights, sale offers, parking use, privacy service, and failure to respond. The Complainant requests transfer of all five disputed domain names and has elected a single-member Panel.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must establish each of the following elements: (i) that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and (iii) that the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has established rights in the BARILLA word mark through the registered rights summarized above. Each disputed domain name reproduces BARILLA in its entirety. The additional terms “fiber”, “protein”, “super”, and “ultra” do not prevent the mark from remaining recognizable. In line with section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ([“WIPO Overview 3.1,”](#)) the addition of descriptive or product-related terms does not avoid a finding of confusing similarity where the trademark remains clearly identifiable.

The disputed domain names, in particular <barillaproteinsuper.com> and <barillaproteinultra.com>, also evoke the Complainant’s BARILLA PROTEINPLUS and BARILLA PROTEIN+ marks. The differences are insufficient to dispel confusing similarity, particularly because the dominant and distinctive element BARILLA is reproduced in full.

Consistent with section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), the “.com” gTLD is disregarded as a technical requirement.

The Panel therefore finds that all five disputed domain names are confusingly similar to trademarks in which the Complainant has rights. The first element of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is satisfied.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. The record contains no authorization or relationship permitting use of the BARILLA mark, and nothing indicates that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names. Consistent with section 2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), the burden shifts to the Respondent, which has provided no rebuttal.

The initial use of the disputed domain names for sale at USD 1,999 each was not a bona fide offering of goods or services. The simultaneous registration of five related domain names targeting the Complainant reinforces this conclusion.

The subsequent pay-per-click parking use likewise fails to establish legitimacy. Section 2.9 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) confirms that monetized parking based on a mark is not legitimate where the links seek to capitalize on reputation and goodwill associated with the Complainant.

The current inactive status does not cure the earlier conduct. The Respondent’s silence in the face of cease-and-desist correspondence and its failure to participate in this proceeding leave the Complainant’s prima facie case un rebutted.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The second element of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy is satisfied.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Turning to the third requirement, the Panel must assess whether the disputed domain names were registered and used in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. As explained in section 3.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), this inquiry considers the circumstances of registration and subsequent use, including whether the Respondent targeted the Complainant's mark, sought to profit from confusion, or engaged in conduct falling within the examples set out in paragraph 4(b).

The Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant and its BARILLA mark when registering the disputed domain names, combining BARILLA with terms corresponding to the Complainant's product concepts only days after European Union applications for BARILLA FIBER and PROTEIN variants (BARILLA FIBER, BARILLA FIBER SUPER, BARILLA FIBER ULTRA, BARILLA PROTEIN SUPER, and BARILLA PROTEIN ULTRA). Offering all five disputed domain names for USD 1,999 each constitutes registration primarily for sale likely in excess of costs, falling within paragraph 4(b)(i) and consistent with section 3.1.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#). The simultaneous registration of five related domain names targeting the same trademark owner supports paragraph 4(b)(ii), in line with section 3.1.2 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#). The pay-per-click parking use provided commercial benefit by exploiting confusion, supporting paragraph 4(b)(iv). The later inactive status does not prevent a bad faith finding; section 3.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) explains that passive holding may constitute bad faith where circumstances show targeting and lack of plausible good-faith use.

The Respondent's use of a privacy service and failure to respond to notices reinforce this conclusion. The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain names were registered and used in bad faith. The third element of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy is satisfied.

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 <barillafiber.com>, <barillafibersuper.com>, <barillafiberultra.com>, <barillaproteinsuper.com>, and <barillaproteinultra.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Daniel Peña/

Daniel Peña

Sole Panelist

Date: September 22, 2026