

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Barilla G. e R. Fratelli S.p.A. v. meat cottage
Case No. D2026-4158

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Barilla G. e R. Fratelli S.p.A., Italy, represented by Studio Barbero S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is meat cottage, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <barilla-global.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 16, 2026. On September 17, 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 confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 18, 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 18, 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 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 11, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Willem J. H. Leppink as the sole panelist in this matter on October 14, 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 following facts are undisputed.

The Complainant is an Italian company founded in 1877 in Parma by Pietro Barilla. Originally established as a small shop selling bread and pasta, the business was taken over in 1910 by Mr Barilla's sons, who steered it towards industrial production. Today, the Complainant is one of the global leaders in the field of oven-baked products, pasta, and ready-made sauces.

The Complainant employs nearly 9,000 people and recorded a turnover of nearly EUR 5 billion in 2025. Its branded products are featured on dining tables around the world. The Complainant has been recognised by a leading reputation data and insights company as the leading food company, receiving awards for its corporate reputation. The BARILLA brand is widely promoted via the Internet and maintains a strong online presence through the most popular social media channels.

The Complainant owns several trademark registrations consisting of or containing the word element BARILLA, among which:

- The International trademark registration No. 349555 for the word/device mark BARILLA, registered on September 26, 1968 for goods and services in classes 5 and 30;
- The International trademark registration No. 675652 for the word mark BARILLA, registered on June 20, 1997 for goods and services in classes 29 and 30;
- The United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK00908585747 for the word mark BARILLA, registered on February 22, 2010, for goods and services in classes 5, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35 and 43.

The Complainant operates its official website at <barilla.com> for the global promotion of the BARILLA brand and products, while the website dedicated to the Barilla Group and all its related brands is published at <barillagroup.com>. Both websites are available in several languages to meet the needs of consumers in different countries. The Complainant has also registered the "Barilla" word and variations thereof in multiple generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") and country-code Top-Level Domains ("ccTLDs").

The disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent on December 1, 2025 and initially redirected to a parked page with pay-per-click ("PPC") links related to the BARILLA trademark and products. Currently, the disputed domain name resolves to an error page, resulting from the Complainant's take-down requests.

On December 29, 2025, the Complainant's representative sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent via email, requesting the immediate cessation of any use of the disputed domain name and its transfer to the Complainant. In the absence of any reply, reminders were sent on January 7, 2026, and April 28, 2026. The Respondent failed to provide any response.

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 the following, being relevant to rendering a decision.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the BARILLA trademark. The disputed domain name incorporates the BARILLA trademark in its entirety. The addition of the word “global” does not alter this conclusion, since “global” is an English adjective used to describe something relating to the entire world, international in scope, or functioning on a worldwide basis. It is therefore a descriptive, non-distinctive term that does not meaningfully differentiate the disputed domain name from the BARILLA trademark.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not a licensee or authorized agent of the Complainant, nor has the Respondent been authorized in any way to register or use the BARILLA trademark. In the absence of any such license or permission, no bona fide or legitimate use of the disputed domain name can reasonably be claimed. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by a name corresponding to the disputed domain name, or that the Respondent has used or made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Nor is there any evidence of legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent clearly registered the disputed domain name in order to attract users seeking information on the Complainant and its products to the Respondent’s own website, thereby creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark for the purpose of generating PPC revenue.

The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Given the Complainant’s international reputation – recognized as such in numerous prior UDRP panel decisions – it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant’s trademark at the time of registration. The composition of the disputed domain name confirms this, as it is nearly identical to the Complainant’s own <barillaglobal.com>, differing only by a hyphen. Moreover, the disputed domain name initially resolved to a webpage featuring PPC links related to the BARILLA mark, demonstrating the Respondent’s intent to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating confusion as to the source, sponsorship, or affiliation with the Complainant.

The Respondent’s incorporation of the Complainant’s registered trademark in the disputed domain name, and its failure to respond to the cease-and-desist letter or participate in this proceeding, , collectively support the conclusion that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Moreover, the disputed domain name has Mail Exchange (“MX”) and Sender Policy Framework (“SPF”) records configured, suggesting it may be used in connection with email addresses that could serve to send misleading or fraudulent communications on behalf of the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, “global”, 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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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.

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.

Panels have generally held that the use of a domain name to host a parked page comprising PPC links, which was the case here before the page was taken down, does not represent a bona fide offering where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant’s mark or otherwise mislead Internet users. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.9.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel refers to its considerations under 6.B.

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.

In the present case, noting the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, and lacking a Response, the Panel finds that the Respondent was clearly targeting the Complainant, its services and its well-known mark and thus intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark. This is evidenced by inter alia the PPC links on the parked page to which the disputed domain name resolved before the page was taken down.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under 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 <barilla-global.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Willem J. H. Leppink/

Willem J. H. Leppink

Sole Panelist

Date: October 21, 2026