ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Iguzzini Illuminazione S.p.A. v. he jxing
Case No. D2026-4133

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Iguzzini Illuminazione S.p.A., Italy, represented by Brimondo AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is he jxing, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <iguzzinius.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 15, 2026. On September 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 17, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY (DT), Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 17, 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 amended Complaint on September 18, 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 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 14, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 21, 2026.

The Center appointed Peter Burgstaller as the sole panelist in this matter on October 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 architectural and professional lighting company founded in 1959 and headquartered in Recanati, Italy. The Complainant owns several trademark registrations containing the mark IGUZZINI, inter alia:

- European Union trademark registration for IGUZZINI (word), Reg. No. 011230208, registered on February 15, 2013;

- United Kingdom trademark registration for IGUZZINI (word), Reg. No. UK00911230208, registered on February 15, 2013; and

- China trademark registration for IGUZZINI; 好光源 好生活 (figurative), Reg. No. 5836419, registered October 21, 2009 (Annex 3 to the Complaint).

Further, the Complainant has registered and uses several domain names containing the mark IGUZZINI, e.g., <iguzzini.com>, <iguzzini.eu>, and <iguzzini.cn>.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 12, 2026. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website displaying information and products relating to lighting systems and the Complainant, including under the menu-button "About iGuzzini". The website also displayed the logo , an address in the same city and with the same postal code as the Complainant's address, and the email address "[…]@iguzzini-light.com", which does not belong to the Complainant and incorporates the domain name <iguzzini-light.com>, which was available for registration at the relevant time (Annexes 5, 6, and 7 to the Complaint).

The Respondent was already engaged in various prior UDRP cases as the respondent which resulted in a finding of bad faith by panels, including *Kingspan Holdings (IRL) Limited v. he jxing*, WIPO Case No. D2026-1710 and *Arista Networks Inc. v. he jxing*, WIPO Case No. D2026-2911 (Annex 8 to the Complaint).

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its mark IGUZZINI, since it only adds the suffix "us".

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; it is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name; and the Complainant has never assigned, granted, licensed, sold, transferred or in any way authorized the Respondent to use the IGUZZINI trademark in any manner.

Further, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The IGUZZINI mark was protected in many countries long before the registration of the disputed domain name, and the mark is distinctive. The Respondent knew or should have known about the Complainant or its trademark.

Moreover, the disputed domain name resolves to a website on which the Respondent is impersonating the Complainant to attract Internet users to the Respondent's website or potentially obtain information through phishing, while displaying the false email address "[…]@iguzzini-light.com". Hence, the disputed domain name is also being used in bad faith.

Finally, the Complainant alleges that the Respondent has been named as the respondent in several similar previous UDRP cases, which further shows the Respondent's bad faith intention.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, 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;
(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to 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.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of the mark IGUZZINI for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark IGUZZINI since it incorporates the entirety of the mark and only adds the term "us" to the IGUZZINI mark.

It has long been established under UDRP decisions that where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the mere addition of other terms (here, "us") does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element of the Policy. This is the case at present, since the mark IGUZZINI is entirely incorporated in the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 1.7 and 1.8.

Finally, it has also long been held that generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") (in this case ".com") are generally disregarded when evaluating the confusing similarity of a disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Although 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 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 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 Complainant has never assigned, granted, licensed, sold, transferred or in any way authorized the Respondent to use the IGUZZINI trademark in any manner. Moreover, the Respondent did not use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; it is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions and hence has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing.

Further, the composition of the disputed domain name, coupled with the use of the disputed domain name for a website displaying an address in the same city and bearing the same postal code as the Complainant's address, together with a false email address, the Complainant's mark, and a logo containing the Complainant's mark, and misleadingly purporting to be either the Complainant or an official website under the control of the Complainant, affirms the Respondent's intention to take unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's mark as to the origin or affiliation of the website at the disputed domain name. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here: claimed impersonation and/or passing off) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

As stated in many decisions rendered under the Policy (e.g., *Robert Ellenbogen v. Mike Pearson,* WIPO Case No. D2000-0001), both conditions, registration and use in bad faith, must be demonstrated; consequently, the Complainant must show that:

- the disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent in bad faith; and
- the disputed domain name is being used by the Respondent in bad faith.

In the present case, the Complainant has provided evidence which demonstrates that it has rights in and is the owner of the distinctive registered trademark IGUZZINI, registered and used in many jurisdictions long before the disputed domain name was registered.

It is inconceivable to this Panel that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's rights, which leads to the necessary inference of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.2. This finding is supported by the fact that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's distinctive trademark IGUZZINI entirely and merely adds the term "us", which may be seen as the country code for the United States of America, further strengthening this finding.

Therefore, the Panel is convinced that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith by the Respondent.

The Complainant has put forward evidence that, at the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name was used by the Respondent for a website featuring the Complainant's mark IGUZZINI and a logo containing the mark IGUZZINI, as well as purporting to provide information about lighting systems, thereby imitating the Complainant's website and business and giving Internet users the false and misleading impression that the site is controlled or at least authorized by the Complainant. This clearly shows that the

Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its mark, which constitutes bad faith use.

The evidence and documents produced and put forward by the Complainant, together with the fact that the Respondent has failed to file a Response and therefore failed to present any evidence of good faith registration and use with regard to the disputed domain name, as well as the fact that the Respondent has been named as the respondent in several previous UDRP cases which resulted in a finding of bad faith, further support the finding that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used by the Respondent in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Based on the available record, 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 <iguzzinius.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Peter Burgstaller/
Peter Burgstaller
Sole Panelist
Date: November 11, 2026