

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Fami S.r.l. v. Abdullah Alameri
Case No. D2026-3925

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Fami S.r.l., Italy, represented by Bugnion S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is Abdullah Alameri, Saudi Arabia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <storevan-sa.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 2, 2026. On September 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same date, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 3, 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 September 7, 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 September 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 28, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 30, 2026.

The Center appointed José Pio Tamassia Santos as the sole panelist in this matter on October 2, 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 manufacturer specializing in industrial furniture and storage solutions for workshops, warehouses and production facilities. Founded in 1929 under the name “Officina Milani”, it adopted its current name “Fami”, in 1962. For over 90 years Fami group has been creating solutions for industrial furnishings and commercial van equipment; its purpose is to make work processes safer and more efficient through solutions specially designed to meet the various requirements.

As far as it is herewith concerned, “Store Van” is a division of the Fami group, founded in 2003 at first as a company producing and marketing fittings for commercial vehicles; then, once incorporated in the group’s parent company, it has become an independent brand in the sector, specializing in the design, manufacturing, and installation of customized fittings and storage solutions for commercial vehicles, transforming vans into efficient and organized mobile workstations.

The “Store Van” division operates all over Italy and Europe.

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registrations corresponding to, or containing, STORE VAN:

- Italian trademark registration No. 0001192992, STORE VAN, filed on September 5, 2006, and registered on May 8, 2009, for the following classes of products: 6, 12, 19, 20;
- Italian trademark registration No. 0001038577, STORE VAN and design, filed on November 28, 2006, and registered on February 13, 2007, for the following classes of products: 6, 12, 19, 20; and
- International trademark registration No. 946261, STORE VAN and design, registered on February 13, 2007, for the following jurisdictions: Switzerland, China, Croatia, Japan, Monaco, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, European Union, Norway, with reference to the following products: 6, 12, 19, 20.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <storevan.com>, registered on August 11, 2000.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 30, 2025, and resolves to a website reproducing the Complainant’s mark, logo, contact information, product images and website elements, presenting itself as “Store Van, a brand of the FAMI Group” on the “Company” page.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its STORE VAN mark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Complainant also contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

For this Complaint to succeed in relation to the disputed domain name the Complainant must prove that:

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

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 disputed domain name <storevan-sa.com> reproduces the STORE VAN mark in its entirety, followed by the term "-sa", and is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. Although the addition of other terms, here, "sa", preceded by a hyphen, 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.

Accordingly, the Complainant has established that the disputed domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's registered STORE VAN mark in which the Complainant has valid trademark rights, and therefore the condition of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is fulfilled.

The Panel finds that the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy identifies three means through which a respondent may establish rights or legitimate interests in a domain name:

"Any of the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, if found by the Panel to be proved based on its evaluation of all evidence presented, shall demonstrate your rights or legitimate interests to the domain name for purposes of [p]aragraph 4(a)(ii):

- (i) before any notice to you of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable 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; or
- (ii) you (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the domain name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) you are 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 or service mark at issue.”

Although the Complainant bears the ultimate burden of establishing all three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, UDRP panels have recognized that this could result in the often-impossible task of proving a negative, requiring the information that is primarily, if not exclusively, within the knowledge of the respondent. Thus, the consensus view is that paragraph 4(c) of the Policy shifts the burden of production to the respondent to come forward with evidence of a right or legitimate interest in the domain name, once the complainant has made prima facie showing (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant).

The Complainant contends that it has never provided authorization to the Respondent to register the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name and that there is no use of the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Panel holds that the composition of the disputed domain name, consisting of the entirety of the Complainant's mark plus the additional term “sa” (which may correspond to the abbreviation of Saudi Arabia, where the Respondent is reportedly located), cannot constitute fair use as it effectively impersonates the Complainant.

Further, the Panel notes that the website under the disputed domain name presents itself as the Complainant by using the Complainant's mark, logo, product images, contact and history information, and website design elements. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Accordingly, the Complainant has established that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain Name and has therefore satisfied the conditions of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

For the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the following four, non-exclusive, circumstances, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith:

“(i) circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) you have registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii). you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv). by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your web site or location or of a product or service on your web site or location.”

In the present case, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name that consists of the entirety of the Complainant's mark STORE VAN plus the additional term "sa" which may be considered as a geographic term, in this case with reference to Saudi Arabia, where the Respondent is reportedly located. Also considering that the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is also similar to the Complainant's domain name, <storevan.com>, and resolves to a website mimicking the Complainant, the Panel finds on balance that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant in mind and to target the Complainant's mark.

Even if the term "storevan" in the disputed domain name may be perceived by the consumers as the combination of the English terms "store" and "van", indicating a van designed or equipped for storage purposes, or more generally, a storage or workshop solution for commercial vans, and consequently as alluding, in a general way, to the nature, intended purpose, or characteristics of the goods, it is worthy to note that – due to the reputation of the Complainant in its business sector and therefore of the STORE VAN mark – the Respondent cannot credibly claim to have been unaware of the mark, as it is clear, also considering the content of the website, that the Respondent knew, or should have known, that its registration of the disputed domain name would be identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark.

Moreover, it must be pointed out that the disputed domain name resolves to a website almost identical to that of the Complainant. In other words, the disputed domain name substantially reproduces the related webpages and design elements of the Complainant's website at the domain name <storevan.com>; the Respondent has even reproduced the Complainant's exact corporate details, contact information and VAT registration number.

The Complainant showed that in all these circumstances, taken singly or cumulatively, on balance it is more likely than not that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith in terms of the Policy.

Accordingly, based on the facts above, the Panel finds that, by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website.

Finally, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Accordingly, the Respondent's conduct undoubtedly constitutes bad-faith registration and use of the disputed domain Name under the Policy, and the Complainant has satisfied the conditions of paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <storevan-sa.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/José Pío Tamassia Santos/

José Pío Tamassia Santos

Sole Panelist

Date: October 16, 2026