

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bulgari S.p.A. v. ren wei
Case No. D2026-3589

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Bulgari S.p.A., Italy, represented by Safenames Ltd, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is ren wei, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bulgariworld.shop> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 12, 2026. On August 13, 2026, 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 confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 7, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Marcello Do Nascimento as the sole panelist in this matter on September 14, 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, Bulgari S.p.A., is an Italian company founded in Rome in 1884 by Sotirios Voulgaris. The Complainant operates internationally in the luxury goods and hospitality sectors and is particularly known for its high-end jewelry, watches, fragrances, accessories, leather goods, and related luxury products. Over the course of more than a century, the Complainant has developed substantial international recognition under the BULGARI and BVLGARI trademarks.

The Complainant conducts its business worldwide through an extensive network of boutiques and authorized retailers and maintains a significant commercial presence in numerous countries. The evidence submitted with the Complaint shows that the Complainant operates stores throughout Europe, Asia, the Middle East, North America, South America, Africa, and Australia. In particular, the record indicates that the Complainant maintains a substantial commercial presence in China, where the Respondent is located, including numerous boutiques and authorized retailers.

The Complainant's activities extend beyond jewelry and luxury goods to the hospitality sector through BVLGARI Hotels & Resorts, with hotels and resorts in international destinations including Milan, London, Dubai, Bali, Beijing, Shanghai, Paris, Tokyo, and Rome, among others.

The Complainant operates its principal website at "www.bulgari.com", through which it promotes and sells its products internationally. The evidence on record also demonstrates a substantial online presence. According to the materials submitted by the Complainant, the official website received approximately 1.69 million visits in June 2026. The Complainant also maintains official accounts on major social media platforms, including Facebook, Instagram, X, and TikTok.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for the marks BULGARI and BVLGARI in jurisdictions throughout the world, all of which significantly predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The record includes, among others, the following trademark registrations:

- International trademark BULGARI, Registration No. 452694, registered on May 15, 1980, covering goods in International Classes 11, 14, 20, and 21;
- Chinese trademark BULGARI, Registration No. 341625, registered on March 10, 1989, in International Class 25; and
- Canadian trademark BVLGARI, Registration No. TMA312178, registered on March 14, 1986.

The record also contains evidence of additional national and international registrations for the BULGARI and BVLGARI marks in numerous jurisdictions and across a broad range of goods and services.

The Panel notes that the Complainant's BULGARI/BVLGARI marks have been extensively used and promoted internationally for many years. The evidence submitted with the Complaint includes examples of international advertising campaigns, worldwide retail operations, substantial website traffic, and a significant social media following. The record further demonstrates that searches for "BULGARI" on major search engines, including Google and Baidu, predominantly return results associated with the Complainant.

The disputed domain name <bulgariworld.shop> was registered on April 28, 2026. According to the Registrar-confirmed registrant information, the Respondent is ren wei, located in China.

The evidence on record shows that the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website. The screenshot submitted by the Complainant shows that attempts to access the disputed domain name resulted in an error message indicating that the site could not be reached.

The record further shows that the Respondent has registered a number of other domain names incorporating third-party trademarks, including <alexanderwang-eu.shop>, <balmain-outlet.shop>, <christianlouboutinworld.shop>, <fatfaceworld.shop>, <givenchy-world.shop>, and <mandukaworld.shop>.

The Whois records submitted by the Complainant identify the same registrant name and email address as those associated with the disputed domain name.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the requirements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are fully satisfied and that the disputed domain name should therefore be transferred to it.

First, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its BULGARI trademark. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name incorporates the BULGARI mark in its entirety, with the addition of the term "world". The Complainant argues that such addition does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, since the BULGARI mark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. The Complainant further submits that the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".shop" should be disregarded for purposes of the comparison under the first element of the Policy.

With respect to the second element of the Policy, the Complainant maintains that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant states that the Respondent does not own any trademark rights in the term BULGARI, has never been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the Complainant's trademark, and has no commercial or other relationship with the Complainant.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and that there is no evidence that the Respondent has acquired any trademark or service mark rights in the terms "Bulgari" or "Bulgariworld".

According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website and the Respondent has not used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Complainant also contends that there is no evidence of any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Finally, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It emphasizes that its BULGARI trademark rights significantly predate the registration of the disputed domain name and that the mark has acquired substantial international recognition and goodwill.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent could not reasonably have been unaware of the Complainant and its trademark when registering the disputed domain name. The Complainant relies on the distinctive character and international reputation of the BULGARI mark, as well as on the fact that searches for "BULGARI" and "bulgariworld" return results associated with the Complainant.

The Complainant further submits that the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of the case. In support of this contention, the Complainant relies on the reputation of its trademark, the absence of any apparent legitimate use of the disputed domain name, and the lack of any plausible good-faith explanation for the Respondent's registration.

The Complainant also relies on evidence that the Respondent has registered a number of other domain names incorporating third-party trademarks, including <alexanderwang-eu.shop>, <balmain[-]outlet.shop>, <christianlouboutinworld.shop>, <fatfaceworld.shop>, and <givenchy-world.shop>. According to the Complainant, such registrations demonstrate a pattern of abusive conduct and further support a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

For these reasons, the Complainant submits that the requirements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been met and requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to it.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not submit any Response to the Complaint. Accordingly, the Respondent has not contested the Complainant's assertions nor provided any evidence of rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, nor any explanation regarding its registration or use.

6. Discussion and Findings

Pursuant to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted, in accordance with the Policy, the Rules, and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove, on the balance of probabilities, each of the following elements:

- a) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainants have rights;
- b) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- c) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel addresses each element in turn.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established rights in the trademark BULGARI through numerous trademark registrations submitted in evidence, which significantly predate the registration of the disputed domain name. These include the ones mentioned under Section 4. above.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's BULGARI trademark in its entirety, followed by the term "world". The Panel therefore considers that the Complainant's trademark is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

In accordance with section 1.7 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark.

The Panel further observes that the disputed domain name includes the additional term "world". The addition of this term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, as the BULGARI trademark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

As reflected in section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms, whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element.

Finally, the Panel notes that the applicable generic gTLD ".shop" is disregarded for purposes of the confusing similarity assessment. As stated in section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), "the applicable Top Level Domain ('TLD') in a domain name [...] is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test."

For these reasons, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights. Accordingly, the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances that may demonstrate a respondent's rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. Although the overall burden of proof rests with the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests may involve the difficult task of establishing a negative fact.

Accordingly, once a complainant establishes a prima facie case that the respondent lacks such rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to present evidence demonstrating otherwise. If the respondent fails to do so, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The record shows that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the BULGARI trademark. There is no evidence indicating that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or by the name "Bulgari", nor is there any indication that the Respondent owns trademark or service mark rights corresponding to the disputed domain name.

The evidence further shows that the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website. The material submitted by the Complainant indicates that attempts to access the disputed domain name resulted in an error message and that the Respondent has not used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

In the Panel's view, such passive holding does not establish rights or legitimate interests within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. Nor does the record disclose any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's BULGARI trademark in its entirety together with the term "world". In the circumstances of this case, the composition of the disputed domain name does not provide any apparent basis for a legitimate use by the Respondent, particularly in the absence of any authorization from the Complainant or any evidence that the Respondent is independently associated with the term "Bulgari".

The Respondent did not submit any Response in this proceeding and has therefore failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case or to demonstrate any of the circumstances set out in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The second element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has therefore 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 sets out a non-exhaustive list of circumstances which, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith. Other circumstances beyond those expressly listed may also be relevant in assessing bad faith registration and use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant's BULGARI and BVLGARI trademarks are long-established, highly distinctive, and widely recognized internationally, and significantly predate the registration of the disputed domain name. Previous UDRP panels involving the Complainant have likewise recognized the highly distinctive character and strong international reputation of the BVLGARI trademark. See, e.g., *Bulgari S.p.A. v. Hettinger Edgar*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-5357](#), where the panel observed that "the Complainant's BVLGARI trademark is highly distinctive and enjoys a strong international reputation."

The evidence submitted with the Complaint further demonstrates the Complainant's substantial international commercial presence, including in China, where the Respondent is located, as well as significant worldwide promotion and online visibility of the Complainant's brand.

The Panel also notes that the Complainant owns numerous longstanding trademark registrations for BULGARI and BVLGARI in multiple jurisdictions and examples can be found under Section 4. above. These registrations significantly predate the registration of the disputed domain name by several decades.

In light of these circumstances, the Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its trademark rights when registering the disputed domain name on April 28, 2026. This conclusion is reinforced by the composition of the disputed domain name, which reproduces the Complainant's BULGARI trademark in its entirety together with the term "world".

The evidence on record also shows that searches for "BULGARI" and "bulgariworld" on major search engines, including Google and Baidu, return top results associated with the Complainant and its brand. In the circumstances, the Panel considers it more likely than not that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark and deliberately targeted it when registering the disputed domain name. Prior UDRP panels have similarly inferred knowledge of the Complainant's trademark rights from the substantial worldwide reputation of the BULGARI/BVLGARI marks. See, e.g., *Bulgari S.p.A. v. Nicholas Akins, TWS*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2221](#). This is also consistent with the approach reflected in the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), according to which the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a widely known trademark, and particularly in the case of coined or fanciful marks, can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name does not currently resolve to an active website. The evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that attempts to access the disputed domain name resulted in an error message indicating that the site could not be reached.

However, the non-use of a disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith. As established in *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#), passive holding of a domain name may, in appropriate circumstances, constitute bad faith registration and use. See also *Bulgari S.p.A. v. Stephane MAMAN, Prestige Immobilier Real Estate LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-4394](#), where the panel confirmed that "the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding." See also [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

Having reviewed the totality of the circumstances, the Panel considers the following factors to be particularly relevant:

- (i) the distinctive character and strong international reputation of the Complainant's BULGARI/BVLGARI trademarks;
- (ii) the existence of numerous trademark registrations for the BULGARI/BVLGARI marks in jurisdictions throughout the world, all of which significantly predate the registration of the disputed domain name;
- (iii) the fact that the disputed domain name reproduces the BULGARI trademark in its entirety;
- (iv) the absence of any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use of the disputed domain name;
- (v) the Respondent's failure to submit any Response or to provide any explanation for the choice and registration of the disputed domain name; and
- (vi) the Respondent's registration of several other domain names incorporating third-party trademarks.

The Panel attaches particular significance to the latter circumstance. The evidence shows that the Respondent has registered domain names including <alexanderwang-eu.shop>, <balmain-outlet.shop>, <christianlouboutinworld.shop>, <fatfaceworld.shop>, and <givenchy-world.shop>, with the corresponding Whois records identifying the same registrant name and email address as those associated with the disputed domain name.

In the Panel's view, these registrations demonstrate a pattern of conduct involving the registration of domain names incorporating third-party trademarks. Paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy expressly identifies as evidence of bad faith circumstances in which a respondent has registered a domain name in order to prevent a trademark owner from reflecting its mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct. See also [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.2.

Taken together, the longstanding and distinctive character of the Complainant's marks, the Respondent's apparent knowledge of the Complainant's rights, the composition of the disputed domain name, its passive holding, the absence of any plausible good-faith explanation, and the Respondent's pattern of registering domain names incorporating third-party trademarks support the conclusion that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 <bulgariworld.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Marcello Do Nascimento/

Marcello Do Nascimento

Sole Panelist

Date: September 29, 2026