

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ariston SpA v. agent egypt, amr amer, social storm, ahmed ashraf/ELWakeel and Sameh Elmahdy
Case No. D2026-4114

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Ariston SpA, Italy, represented by Mar.Bre Srl, Italy.

The Respondents are agent egypt, amr amer; social storm, social storm; ahmed ashraf, ELWakeel and Sameh Elmahdy, all Egypt.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <ariston-company.com> ("Domain Name 1"), <ariston-eg.net> ("Domain Name 6"), <aristonegypt.com> ("Domain Name 5"), <ariston-official.com> ("Domain Name 2"), <ariston-website.com> ("Domain Name 3") and <ariston-eg.com> ("Domain Name 4") are registered with NameCheap, Inc. The disputed domain name <ariston-eg-service.com> ("Domain Name 8") is registered with Launchpad.com Inc. The disputed domain name <ariston-egy.com> ("Domain Name 9") is registered with Name.com, Inc. The disputed domain name <ariston-support.net> ("Domain Name 10") is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB. The disputed domain name <eg-ariston.com> ("Domain Name 7") is registered with Network Solutions, LLC (Together the Registrars are referred to as the "Registrar"). Together the disputed domain names are referred to as the "Domain Names".

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 12, 2026. On September 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Names. On September 15, and September 16, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Names which differed from the named Respondent (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy/ Privacy service provided by PERFECT PRIVACY, LLC/ Privacy service provided by Domain Protection Services, Inc./ Registrant details redacted) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 17, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints for the domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on September 21, 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 September 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 13, 2026. The Response was filed by one of the Respondents, Sameh Elmahdy, with the Center on September 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on October 21, 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 to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant's registered ARISTON trademarks are used worldwide in relation to heating, water-heating, household-appliance, installation, repair and related products and services.

The Complainant owns a number of trademark registrations for ARISTON, such as International Trademark Registrations no. 684565, registered on August 19, 1997; and no. 804891, registered on April 7, 2003. The Complainant has registered several domain names, including <ariston.com>, <aristonhome.com>, <aristongroup.com>, <aristonservice.com>, <aristonshop.com> and <ariston.eg>.

The Domain Names have been registered in the period between November 15, 2017, and April 26, 2025. The Domain Name 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10 all at one point have resolved to active webpages offering maintenance/repair services in Egypt. Domain Name 1, 2, and 6 resolve to an error page.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant argues that the Domain Names are under common control of the same person or entity and should be consolidated in the same proceeding. The Complainant points out that the Registrar-disclosed information establishes that the Domain Name 1, 2 and 3 are registered to the same registrant (ahmed ashraf,ELWakeel). Domain Name 4, 5 and 6 are registered to the same registrant (Sameh Elmahdy). Domain Name 7 and 8 are both registered under the name "agent egypt". The available evidence, considered cumulatively, supports the inference that the Domain Names form part of the same coordinated network and are subject to common control as all ten Domain Names target the same Complainant, the same trademark, the same Egyptian market and the same activity, namely repair, maintenance and technical assistance services for ARISTON appliances. Where the Domain Names resolve to active websites, the websites prominently use the ARISTON mark and present themselves as ARISTON service or maintenance operations in Egypt. Domain Name 3 and 4 both resolve to websites that implement the same content-protection functionality and display the identical message "Content is protected!!". It establishes a link between the registrant of Domain Names 1-3 (ahmed ashraf,ELWakeel) and the registrant of Domain Names 4-6 (Sameh Elmahdy). The Domain Name 7 and 8 are registered by the same registrant

(agent egypt) and Domain Name 7 follows virtually the same domain-name construction as Domain Name 6, merely reversing the order of the same elements. According to the Complainant, some of the contact details for Domain Name 9 and 10 suggest that the Domain Names forms part of an organized online appliance-maintenance activity directed to the Egyptian market and reinforce the allegation that all the Domain Names are under common control.

The Complainant documents registered trademark rights in ARISTON and argues that the trademark is clearly recognizable in each of the Domain Names. The additional geographical, descriptive or affiliation-suggestive terms reinforce the false impression of official or authorized ARISTON service channels in Egypt.

The Complainant submits that the Respondents lack rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names.

The Complainant has not licensed, authorized or otherwise permitted the Respondents to register a domain name incorporating the ARISTON mark or to use the mark in connection with the websites at issue. None of the disclosed registrants is commonly known by ARISTON or by any of the Domain Names.

The active websites use the ARISTON mark prominently and offer assistance, repair, installation and maintenance services for ARISTON products. Such use is not a bona fide offering. The Domain Names that did not display accessible website content at the time of the Complainant's review confer no rights or legitimate interests. Moreover, the recurring pattern of ARISTON domain registrations targeting Egypt, shows that the current configuration of the Domain Names is only a snapshot of a broader coordinated pattern. In these circumstances, the Complainant cannot see any plausible good faith use that would not misleadingly suggest a connection with the Complainant.

The Complainant argues that the Respondents had the Complainant in mind at the time of registration of the Domain Names. The Domain Names were registered many years after the Complainant acquired registered rights in the ARISTON mark. The deliberate combination of the mark with terms such as "company", "official", "website", "eg", "service", strongly supports the inference that the Respondents were aware of the Complainant, its products and its after-sales sector at the time of registration. The active websites intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users seeking ARISTON assistance and repair services by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement. The prominent display of the ARISTON mark and the offer of services specifically relating to ARISTON products make coincidence implausible. The present non-use of Domain Name 1, 2 and 6 does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the passive holding doctrine.

B. Respondents

The Respondents agent egypt, amr amer, social storm, social storm, ahmed ashraf,ELWakeel did not reply to the Complainant's contentions. The Respondent Sameh Elmahdy (listed as registrant of Domain Name 4, 5 and 6) contends that the Complainant has not satisfied the elements required under the Policy for a transfer. The registrant Sameh Elmahdy argues that Domain Name 4, 5 and 6 are used in good faith for offering legitimate independent repair and maintenance services in Egypt as his "business operates as an independent technical service provider in Egypt, specializing in appliance maintenance and repair services. The use of the term 'Ariston' on the website is strictly for nominative fair use" and "to inform consumers of the specific brand of appliances my technicians are qualified to repair". Sameh Elmahdy asserts that his websites prominently display clear, transparent disclaimers on both the homepage and privacy policy pages, stating explicitly that the Respondent is an independent repair center and not the official agent or owner of the ARISTON trademark. Therefore, the Respondent argues that "no attempt has been made to mislead consumers or pass off the business as the official manufacturer or authorized distributor". Consequently, according to the Respondent, "the domain names were registered in good faith to accurately describe the specialized repair services offered to the local Egyptian market". The Respondent has submitted screenshots dated September 23, 2026 with the mentioned disclaimer in English and Arabic.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Issue: Consolidation of Multiple Respondents

The Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant argues that the domain name registrants are the same entity or under common control. The Complainant requests consolidation of the disputes against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules. Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder. In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.11.2.

As regards the common control, the Panel notes that the Domain Names appear to target the Complainant in a similar fashion. The Domain Names have similar pattern of composition. The Complainant has established a connection between five different listed registrants. In particular, the Registrar-disclosed information establishes direct links within several groups of the Domain Names. The available evidence, considered cumulatively, supports the inference that the Domain Names are subject to common control as all Domain Names target the same trademark, the same Egyptian market and, where actively used, are associated with the same activity, namely repair, maintenance and technical assistance services for ARISTON appliances. The use of the Domain Names, including the fact that some of the registrants operate with the same or similar content on their websites, points to common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party. Even if registrant Sameh Elmahdy has responded directly only in relation to Domain Name 4, 5 and 6, he, or any of the other registrants, has not objected to the Complainant's consolidation request.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

6.2 Substantive Issues

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the Domain Names. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has established registered trademark rights in the ARISTON trademark. The Domain Names incorporate the Complainant's trademark with different additions such as "egypts", "-official", "-website", "-eg", "-eg-service", "-egy", "-support" and "eg-", or a minor misspelling of the trademark. The additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Names and the trademark. For the purpose of assessing the confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel may disregard the Top-Level Domains ("TLDs"). See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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. While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent is not affiliated with or related to the Complainant. There is no evidence that the Respondent has registered the Domain Names as a trademark or acquired trademark rights. The Complainant submits that for the Domain Names that have not resolved to active website content, there is no use that can confer rights or legitimate interests. As for the Domain Names the Respondent has used for websites, the use is not a bona fide offering under the Policy. The Respondent disagrees and argues that the use of the term “Ariston” on the website is strictly for nominative fair use.

The Panel has carefully examined the Respondent’s use of the Domain Names and cannot agree with the Respondent. The use is not nominative fair use under the Policy. As for the Domain Names that resolve to webpages offering maintenance/repair services in Egypt, despite the Respondent submitting that the websites include disclaimers, the Panel finds on the evidence that none of the websites accurately and prominently disclosed the registrant’s relationship with the trademark holder. Moreover, the composition of the Domain Names carries a risk of impersonation and misrepresentation. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. The Domain Names have the Complainant’s trademark incorporated but only one of the Domain Names has a description of maintenance or repair services indicated in the Domain Name. Finally, the number of Domain Names in this case indicates that the Respondent tries to corner the repair and service market in Egypt, by intentionally attracting Internet users seeking ARISTON assistance and repair services by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement.

Based on the evidence of the case, the Panel finds that the use of the Domain Names is not bona fide, but rather evidence of bad faith, see below

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.

The composition and use of the Domain Names prove that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant when the Respondent registered them. The use of the Domain Names is evidence that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, online users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark. The number of Domain Names that encompass the Complainant’s trademark points to that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of abusive conduct.

The non-use of a few of the Domain Names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the passive holding doctrine. The Complainant’s trademark has distinctiveness and reputation. The Respondent has not provided evidence of good-faith use, and several of the Domain Names appear to be registered with concealed or inaccurate contact details. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

For the reasons set out above, the Panel concludes that the Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

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 the Domain Names <ariston-company.com>, <ariston-eg.net>, <ariston-eg-service.com>, <ariston-egy.com>, <aristonegypt.com>, <ariston-official.com>, <ariston-support.net>, <ariston-website.com>, <ariston-eg.com> and <eg-ariston.com> transferred to the Complainant.

/Mathias Lilleengen/

Mathias Lilleengen

Sole Panelist

Date: October 23, 2026