

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Confederazione Nazionale Coldiretti v. Donna Hamilton
Case No. D2026-3553

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Confederazione Nazionale Coldiretti, Italy, represented by Società Italiana Brevetti S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is Donna Hamilton, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <cafcoldiretti.com> 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 11, 2026. On the same day, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 14, 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 (Redacted for Privacy, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 14, 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 18, 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 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Simone Huser 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

As stated in the Complaint, the Complainant, founded in 1944, is the largest agricultural organization in Italy and one of the most influential farming associations in Europe. It operates as a union to represent individual farmers, cooperatives, agri-food enterprises, fisheries, and the broader supply chain.

The Complainant owns various trademark registrations, including the Italian Trademark Registration No. 0001387904 for COLDIRETTI and design, registered on December 13, 2010.

The Complainant holds the domain name <coldiretti.it>, which hosts its main website.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 15, 2026.

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page displaying “Welcome to nginx! If you see this page, the nginx web server is successfully installed and working. Further configuration is required. For online documentation and support please refer to nginx.org. Commercial support is available at nginx.com. Thank you for using nginx.”.

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends as follows:

The disputed domain name is identical to the registered trademark in which the Complainant has rights, because it incorporates the Complainant’s mark COLDIRETTI in its entirety, and only differs by the addition of the term “caf”, which is a known Italian acronym standing for “Centro di Assistenza Fiscale” (Tax Assistance Centre).

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has no connection or affiliation with the Complainant, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and there is no evidence of the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, the website at the disputed domain name is resolving to a parking page.

The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, considering the reputation of the Complainant’s trademark COLDIRETTI. By registering the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to exploit the reputation of the Complainant’s trademark. The Respondent intentionally tries to attract, for commercial gain and possibly fraudulent purposes, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its websites.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 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 textual element COLDIRETTI of the mark is recognizable 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](#), sections 1.7 and 1.10.

Although the addition of other terms here, "caf", 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 and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark, and there is no evidence of any relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent, nor of any authorization granted by the Complainant to use its trademark in a domain name. Moreover, the disputed domain name which incorporates the entirety of the Complainant's mark and is confusingly similar thereto resolves to a default "nginx" page, which does not establish any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

In these circumstances, 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.

In the view of the Panel, noting that the Complainant's trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain name and noting the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the Complainant's online presence, it is more likely than not that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's rights and targeting them when registering the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name resolves to a parking page. 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.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panelists have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. 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 thus finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy with regard to the disputed domain name.

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 <cafcoldiretti.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Simone Huser/

Simone Huser

Sole Panelist

Date: September 30, 2026