ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Antonio Lupi Design S.p.A. v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2026-4077

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Antonio Lupi Design S.p.A., Italy, represented by Società Italiana Brevetti S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is Name Redacted. [1]

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <antoniolupi.live> is registered with Dynadot LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 10, 2026. On September 11, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 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 (Dynadot Privacy Service, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 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 two amended Complaints on September 16, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint, together with the amended Complaints, 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").

[1] The Respondent appears to have used the name of an unrelated third party individual when registering the disputed domain name. In light of potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent's name in the Decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding, and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. D2009-1788.

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 9, 2026.

The Center appointed David Taylor as the sole panelist in this matter on October 15, 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 joint-stock company operating in the furniture and interior-design sector, specializing in the design, manufacture, and sale of bathroom furnishings and related products, including washbasins, mirrors, bathtubs, shower systems, and bathroom furniture. The Complainant markets its products internationally through showrooms, distributors, and resellers.

The Complainant owns numerous registrations for the ANTONIO LUPI and ANTONIOLUPI marks, including:

- European Union Trade Mark No. 001632264, ANTONIO LUPI, registered on May 28, 2001;
- International Registration No. 745251, ANTONIO LUPI, registered on September 19, 2000; and
- International Registration No. 1102238, ANTONIOLUPI (figurative), registered on November 9, 2011.

The Complainant is also the registrant of numerous domain names comprising its trademarks, including <antoniolupi.it> and <antoniolupi.com>. The website "www.antoniolupi.it" serves as the Complainant's main corporate website.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 11, 2026. Shortly after its registration, the disputed domain name resolved to a website reproducing content from the website of a third-party Italian luxury-furniture company. The evidence provided by the Complainant demonstrates that the third-party company subsequently requested and obtained the removal of the copied content. At the time of this decision, the disputed domain name no longer resolves to an active website.

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.

The Complainant asserts rights in the ANTONIO LUPI and ANTONIOLUPI trademarks. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is identical to its trademarks.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. In particular, the Complainant states that it has not authorized or otherwise consented to the Respondent's registration or use of the disputed domain name. The Complainant also relies on trademark searches indicating that the Respondent owns no trademark applications or registrations for "Antonio Lupi" or "Antoniolupi".

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant asserts that, at the time the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, the Complainant's business and ANTONIO LUPI and ANTONIOLUPI marks were already well established and internationally known, particularly in the bathroom-furniture sector. The Complainant therefore maintains that the Respondent knew, or should have known, of its prior rights.

The Complainant further contends that "Antonio Lupi" is neither a common nor a descriptive expression, that the disputed domain name reproduces its mark without authorization, and that there is no connection between the Respondent and the Complainant's trademarks, company name, or principal domain name.

The Complainant observes that the Respondent's website previously reproduced content from the website of a third-party Italian luxury-furniture company, described as a potential competitor of the Complainant. The Complainant submits that this use of the disputed domain name supports a finding of bad faith. The Complainant further questions the accuracy of the Respondent's disclosed contact information and relies on this as an additional indication of bad faith.

The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In order to prevail, the Complainant must demonstrate that it has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy:

(i) The disputed 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 respect of the disputed domain name; and

(iii) The disputed domain name was 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 reproduces the textual element of the Complainant's ANTONIOLUPI mark. It also reproduces the Complainant's ANTONIO LUPI word mark, altered only by the omission of a space between the two words. The Complainant's marks are therefore recognizable within the disputed domain name. The Panel finds the disputed domain name to be identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's marks for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The generic Top-Level Domain ".live" is a standard registration requirement and is disregarded in the assessment of identity or confusing similarity. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that 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 Complainant states that it has not authorized or otherwise consented to the Respondent's registration or use of the disputed domain name. The evidence submitted by the Complainant also indicates that the Respondent does not own any trademark applications or registrations for "Antonio Lupi" or "Antoniolupi".

The record shows that the disputed domain name, which reproduces the Complainant's marks, resolved to a website copying content from the website of a third party operating in the luxury-furniture sector. The copied content was subsequently removed. The Panel finds that the use of the disputed domain name in this manner does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. Such use is also liable to divert Internet users seeking the Complainant online. The Respondent has provided no explanation for that use.

The Panel further finds that there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

Nor does the record indicate that the Respondent has made any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name consists solely of the textual element of the Complainant's ANTONIOLUPI mark and reproduces the Complainant's ANTONIO LUPI word mark without the space between the two words. It therefore carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant, further undermining any claim of fair use. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

The Complainant's ANTONIO LUPI and ANTONIOLUPI trademark registrations substantially predate the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name on August 11, 2026. The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's marks. In light of the composition of the disputed domain name and the use

to which it was put, the Panel infers that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its rights when registering the disputed domain name.

As noted above, the record shows that the disputed domain name resolved to a website reproducing content from the website of another Italian company operating in the furniture sector. The fact that the copied content originated from a third party rather than from the Complainant does not provide a good-faith explanation for the Respondent's conduct. On the contrary, the use of a domain name reproducing the Complainant's mark to display copied content relating to another business operating in the same sector reinforces the inference that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name were directed at the Complainant and its mark. Even in the absence of evidence establishing the Respondent's precise commercial purpose, the examples of bad faith set out in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy are non-exhaustive. Given that the disputed domain name closely matches the Complainant's marks, Internet users encountering the disputed domain name would be likely to expect a website associated with the Complainant. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to display copied content relating to another business operating in the same sector, without any apparent legitimate explanation, is inconsistent with good-faith use.

Having considered the composition of the disputed domain name, the Complainant's longstanding prior rights in and use of its marks, the nature of the website content, and the absence of any credible alternative explanation from the Respondent, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The fact that the disputed domain name no longer resolves to an active website does not materially affect the Panel's findings above, as its subsequent inactivity does not negate the Respondent's prior use of the disputed domain name as described above.

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 <antoniolupi.live> be transferred to the Complainant.

/David Taylor/
David Taylor
Sole Panelist
Date: November 3, 2026