ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Luigi Lavazza S.p.A. v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2026-4187

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Luigi Lavazza S.p.A., Italy, represented by STUDIO BARBERO S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is Name Redacted.[1]

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lavazza-eg.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 17, 2026. On September 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 22, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name that 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 22, 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 24, 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").

[1]The Respondent appears to have used the name of an unrelated individual and organization when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent's name from this 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Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding and has indicated Annex 1 to this Decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case.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 29, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 19, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Steven Auvil as the sole panelist in this matter on October 23, 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, Luigi Lavazza S.p.A., is an Italian producer of coffee products. Its business traces back to 1895, when Luigi Lavazza opened a grocery shop in Turin, Italy, and the joint-stock company Luigi Lavazza S.p.A. was established in 1927. The Complainant manufactures and sells a broad range of espresso blends, capsules, and coffee machines, operates in over 140 countries, and employs more than 5,800 people worldwide. According to the Complainant, the Lavazza Group achieved revenues of EUR 3.9 billion in 2025. The Complainant has promoted its LAVAZZA brand through long-running advertising campaigns and the Lavazza Calendar, and the brand has appeared in the Reputation Institute "Global RepTrak 100" ranking.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for LAVAZZA, including: International Trademark Registration No. 317174, registered on July 18, 1966; European Union Trade Mark No. 000317057, registered on May 25, 1998; and International Trademark Registration No. 1186133, registered on July 29, 2013.

The Complainant reports that it holds more than 1,000 domain names containing the LAVAZZA mark, including <lavazza.com>, registered on May 19, 1996, which resolves to its official website promoting its company and coffee products.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 22, 2026. According to the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying the title "LAVAZZA EGYPT" and the statement "Brewed to Perfection" over an image of coffee beans, a contact form, an invitation to "Sign up for our email list for updates, promotions, and more", a chatbot labelled "Lavazza Egypt", and the copyright line "Copyright © 2026 Lavazza Egypt - All Rights Reserved". The website contains no disclaimer of any relationship with the Complainant.

On March 4, 2026, the Complainant's representative sent a cease-and-desist communication to the Respondent through the contact form on the website at the disputed domain name and to the privacy-service email addresses associated with the disputed domain name and also submitted a trademark infringement contact request through the Registrar's online form. Reminders were sent on March 20, 2026, and March 30, 2026. The Respondent did not reply.

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.

First, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name incorporates its LAVAZZA trademark in its entirety, and that the addition of a hyphen and the letters "eg", which Internet users would understand as a geographic reference to Egypt, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Second, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is not a licensee or authorized agent of the Complainant, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and has not used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or for a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, since the website at the disputed domain name impersonates the Complainant or an affiliate under the title "LAVAZZA EGYPT", and the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation.

Finally, the Complainant contends that, given the reputation of the LAVAZZA mark, the Respondent must have known of the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, potentially to collect user data through its contact form, chatbot, and email sign-up. The Complainant also relies on the Respondent's failure to respond to its cease-and-desist letter and, in its amendment, on the Respondent's use of its Egyptian distributor's identity when registering the disputed domain name and the apparent link to the domain name of that distributor.

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 accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to decide on the remedy sought by the Complainant, each of the following three elements will be examined:

(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 domain name; and

(iii) the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

In view of the Respondent's failure to submit a Response, the Panel is entitled to accept as true the allegations set forth in the Complaint (unless the evidence is clearly contradictory), and to derive reasonable inferences from the evidence presented. The Panel therefore makes the following findings and conclusions based on the allegations and evidence contained in the Complaint and reasonable inferences drawn from the evidence presented and the Respondent's failure to respond to the Complaint.

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 Complainant owns multiple registered trademarks for LAVAZZA and has used the name since at least 1895.

The entirety of the Complainant's LAVAZZA 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, a hyphen and the letters “eg”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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.

Further, as set forth in section 1.11.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, the applicable generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) (e.g., “.com” or “.org”) is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element’s confusing similarity test. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the use of the gTLD “.com” in the disputed domain name has no bearing on the confusing similarity analysis.

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 is not affiliated with the Complainant, has not been authorized to use the LAVAZZA mark, and there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds no evidence of a bona fide offering of goods or services, legitimate noncommercial use, or any other basis supporting rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent. In fact, the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant by reproducing the Complainant’s mark in the website’s title, chatbot name, and copyright notice, and inviting visitors to submit their contact details, without any disclaimer of a relationship with the Complainant. This impersonation/passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the LAVAZZA mark is distinctive, corresponds to the surname of the Complainant’s founder, and has been registered for decades, including through an international registration designating Egypt since 1966. The disputed domain name pairs that mark with “eg”, a reference to Egypt, where the Complainant has an official distributor, and resolves to a coffee-themed website titled “LAVAZZA EGYPT”. The Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without the Complainant and its mark in mind. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4.

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 facts and circumstances here support a finding of bad faith. The Panel finds that the Respondent, without authorization, appears to have registered the disputed domain name using the name and contact details of the Complainant's official Egyptian distributor and its Managing Director. The provision of false or third-party registration data to conceal a registrant's identity is itself indicative of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.6. The Panel further finds that the disputed domain name resolves to a website that impersonates the Complainant by reproducing the Complainant's mark in the website's title, chatbot name, and copyright notice, and inviting visitors to submit their contact details. This use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed impersonation/passing off and the potential collection of Internet users' personal data, constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under the Policy.

Accordingly, 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 <lavazza-eg.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Steven Auvil/
Steven Auvil
Sole Panelist
Date: November 6, 2026