

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Parmalat S.p.A. v. Vladimir Volf

Case No. D2026-3745

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Parmalat S.p.A., Italy, represented by Studio Barbero S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is Vladimir Volf, Russian Federation.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <parmalat.site> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Registrar of Domain Names REG.RU LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 21, 2026. On August 21, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On August 24, 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 Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on August 25, 2026.

On August 24, 2026, the Center informed the parties in Russian and English that the language of the registration agreement for the Domain Name is Russian. On August 25, 2026, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceedings. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

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 in English and Russian of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 22, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Piotr Nowaczyk as the sole panelist in this matter on September 28, 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 dairy and food company founded in 1961. It is the parent company of the Parmalat Group, which operates internationally in the production and distribution of dairy products and fruit beverages. Since 2011, the Complainant has been controlled by the Lactalis Group. The Parmalat Group operates in 24 countries, including the Russian Federation, with over 90 production sites and more than 27,000 employees worldwide.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations for PARMALAT, including:

- the International Trademark Registration for PARMALAT No. 469307, registered on June 16, 1982;
- the International Trademark Registration for PARMALAT No. 664731, registered on February 7, 1996;
and
- the International Trademark Registration for PARMALAT No. 378105, registered on May 6, 1971.

The Complainant is also the owner of numerous domain names incorporating its PARMALAT trademark, including <parmalat.com>, <parmalat.net>, and <parmalat.it>.

The Domain Name was registered on June 10, 2026.

According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, at the time the Complaint was filed, the Domain Name resolved to a page on the Dynadot marketplace offering the Domain Name for sale. As of the date of this Decision, the Domain Name continues to redirect to a page on the Dynadot platform offering it for sale.

The Complainant states that a web agency informed it that the Respondent had requested USD 300 for the transfer of the Domain Name. On July 2, 2026, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent. It requested that the Respondent cease using the Domain Name and transfer it to the Complainant. The Complainant sent a reminder on July 22, 2026. The Respondent did not reply.

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 Domain Name.

First, the Complainant contends that the Domain Name is identical to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

Second, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has neither rights nor legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

Third, the Complainant submits that the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy places a burden on the Complainant to prove the presence of three separate elements, which can be summarized as follows:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The applicable standard of proof in UDRP cases is the “balance of probabilities” or “preponderance of the evidence”; some panels have also expressed this as an “on balance” standard. Under this standard, a party should demonstrate to a panel’s satisfaction that it is more likely than not that a claimed fact is true. See section 4.2 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)).

6.1. Procedural Issues

A. Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the Domain Name is Russian. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons. First, the Complainant contends that translating the Complaint and supporting documents into Russian would cause undue delay and expense. Second, the Complainant submits that the Respondent understands English, as evidenced by the English-language website associated with the Domain Name and the Respondent’s correspondence in English with a third party web agency. Third, the Complainant notes that the Respondent did not reply to the cease-and-desist correspondence sent in English or request a translation. Fourth, the Complainant argues that English is not the native language of either Party and would therefore constitute a neutral language. Fifth, the Complainant refers to previous UDRP proceedings involving the Respondent in which English was accepted as the language of the proceeding.

The Respondent did not comment on the Complainant’s request for the language of the proceeding to be English.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties’ ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs. See section 4.5.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

The Panel accepts that substantial additional expense and delay would likely be incurred if the Complaint had to be translated into Russian. Moreover, the Panel notes that the Respondent did not comment or object to the Complainant’s arguments concerning the language of the proceeding or otherwise partake in the proceedings despite the Center’s notices having been communicated in both Russian and English.

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2. Substantive Issues

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Under the first element, the Complainant must establish that the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant holds valid registrations for the PARMALAT trademark. The Domain Name incorporates this trademark in its entirety. As numerous UDRP panels have held, in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark. See section 1.7 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

The generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.site” in the Domain Name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. See section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Given the above, the Panel finds that the Domain Name is identical to the Complainant’s PARMALAT trademark. Thus, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under the second element, the Complainant must prove that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

A right or legitimate interest in the Domain Name may be established, in accordance with paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, if the Panel finds any of the following circumstances:

- (i) that the Respondent has used or made preparations to use the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services prior to the notice of the dispute; or
- (ii) that the Respondent is commonly known by the Domain Name, even if the Respondent has not acquired any trademark rights; or
- (iii) that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark.

In the present case, the Complainant’s PARMALAT trademark registrations predate the Respondent’s registration of the Domain Name. There is no evidence in the case record that the Complainant has licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the PARMALAT trademark or to register the Domain Name incorporating this trademark.

Moreover, it results from the evidence on record that the Respondent does not make use of the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor does it make a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name. Instead, at the time of filing of the Complaint and as of the date of this Decision, the Domain Name resolved to a page offering it for sale for USD 270. The Respondent also requested USD 300 for its transfer in correspondence with a web agency. In the Panel’s view, these amounts appear to exceed the out-of-pocket costs directly related to the Domain Name. The Respondent has neither provided any explanation or evidence of such costs nor contested the Complainant’s allegations in this regard. In the circumstances of this case, the Respondent’s use of the Domain Name cannot be considered either a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Finally, the Panel considers that the composition of the Domain Name carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. See section 2.5.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Given the above, there are no circumstances in evidence which could demonstrate, pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in respect of the Domain Name. Thus, there is no evidence in the case record that refutes the Complainant's prima facie case. In sum, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under the third element, the Complainant must prove that the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Bad faith under the UDRP is broadly understood to occur where a respondent takes unfair advantage of or otherwise abuses a complainant's mark. See section 3.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy, evidence of bad faith registration and use includes, without limitation:

- (i) circumstances indicating the domain name was registered or acquired primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the owner of a trademark or service mark or to a competitor of the trademark owner, for valuable consideration in excess of the documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) circumstances indicating that the domain name was registered in order to prevent the owner of a trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) circumstances indicating that the domain name was registered primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) circumstances indicating that the domain name has intentionally been used in an attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with a trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or location or of a product or service on a website or location.

As indicated above, the Complainant's rights in the PARMALAT trademark predate the registration of the Domain Name. This Panel finds that the Respondent was or should have been aware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration. This finding is supported by the composition of the Domain Name, which consists entirely of the Complainant's PARMALAT trademark, as well as by the evidence on record establishing that the trademark is well known and distinctive. The Complainant has an established international business, including operations in the Russian Federation, where the Respondent is located. The Panel considers it unlikely that the Respondent independently selected this term without knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark. In sum, the Panel finds that, more likely than not, the Respondent registered the Domain Name with the intention of taking advantage of the reputation of the Complainant's PARMALAT trademark.

Moreover, the Panel finds, on the balance of probabilities, that the Domain Name was registered and used in bad faith by the Respondent for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Domain Name registration for valuable consideration in excess of the documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the Domain Name.

Generally speaking, panels have found that the practice as such of registering a domain name for subsequent resale (including for a profit) would not by itself support a claim that the respondent registered the domain name in bad faith with the primary purpose of selling it to a trademark owner (or its competitor). See section 3.1.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

If, on the other hand, circumstances indicate that the respondent's intent in registering the disputed domain name was in fact to profit in some fashion from or otherwise exploit the complainant's trademark, panels will find bad faith on the part of the respondent. Although panel assessment remains fact-specific, generally speaking such circumstances, alone or together, include: (i) the respondent's likely knowledge of the complainant's rights, (ii) the distinctiveness of the complainant's mark, (iii) a pattern of abusive registrations by the respondent, (iv) website content targeting the complainant's trademark, e.g., through links to the complainant's competitors, (v) threats to point or actually pointing the domain name to trademark-abusive content, (vi) threats to "sell to the highest bidder" or otherwise transfer the domain name to a third party, (vii) failure of a respondent to present a credible evidence-backed rationale for registering the domain name, (viii) a respondent's request for goods or services in exchange for the domain name, (ix) a respondent's attempt to force the complainant into an unwanted business arrangement, (x) a respondent's past conduct or business dealings, or (xi) a respondent's registration of additional domain names corresponding to the complainant's mark subsequent to being put on notice of its potentially abusive activity. See section 3.1.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Particularly where the domain name at issue is identical or confusingly similar to a highly distinctive or famous mark, panels have tended to view with a degree of skepticism a respondent defense that the domain name was merely registered for legitimate speculation (based for example on any claimed dictionary meaning) as opposed to targeting a specific brand owner. See section 3.1.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

In the present case, the Panel finds that the circumstances surrounding the registration and use of the Domain Name support a finding of bad faith. First, the Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's distinctive PARMALAT trademark in its entirety, making it unlikely that the Respondent selected it independently of the Complainant's trademark. Second, the Domain Name was offered for sale on the Dynadot marketplace for USD 270. The Respondent also indicated in correspondence with a third-party web agency that the Domain Name was available for purchase for approximately USD 300. These amounts appear to exceed the ordinary out-of-pocket costs directly related to the registration and maintenance of the Domain Name. The Respondent has not provided any evidence of such costs or any credible explanation for its choice of the Domain Name. Third, there is no evidence of an actual or contemplated legitimate use of the Domain Name. Finally, the Complainant notes that the Respondent has been involved in previous UDRP proceedings resulting in the transfer of domain names to the respective complainants. See, e.g., *Carrefour SA v. Vladimir Volf*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-1665](#); *Amundi Asset Management v. Vladimir Volf*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-2592](#).

Finally, the Respondent's failure to respond to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letters further supports the finding of bad faith.

For the reasons discussed above, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 Domain Name <parmalat.site> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Piotr Nowaczyk/

Piotr Nowaczyk

Sole Panelist

Date: October 12, 2026