ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Iveco S.p.A. v. Grilly Vards, Ivecogroupusa
Case No. D2026-4564

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Iveco S.p.A., Italy, represented by Studio Barbero S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is Grilly Vards, Ivecogroupusa.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ivecogroupusa.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 8, 2026. On October 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 8, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 9, 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 October 9, 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 October 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 29, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 30, 2026.

The Center appointed Alexandre Nappey as the sole panelist in this matter on October 30, 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 IVECO S.p.A., an Italian manufacturer of commercial and industrial vehicles, created in 1975.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations containing IVECO or IVECO GROUP, among which:

- International word trademark registration IVECO No. 426061 on October 21, 1976, and duly renewed; and
- International word trademark registration IVECO GROUP No. 1688211 on October 27, 2021, and duly renewed.

The Complainant's business is promoted through websites at "www.iveco.com" and "www.ivecogroup.com". The Complaint states that the group uses email addresses ending in "@ivecogroup.com".

The disputed domain name was registered on September 23, 2026. The screenshot submitted with the Complaint shows a Zoho holding page.

The Domain Name System evidence submitted with the Complaint shows Mail Exchange ("MX") records for Zoho mail servers and a Sender Policy Framework ("SPF") record authorizing Zoho mail services, indicating that the disputed domain name was configured for email use.

The Complainant has submitted a screenshot of an email dated September 25, 2026, displaying the sender address "[…]@ivecogroupusa.com".[1] The message purported to offer employment as a remote live chat agent, requested completion and return of employment documents and a photograph of the recipient's identification card, and displayed the IVECO GROUP logo. It was signed by a person purporting to be the group's Human Resources Business Manager.

Further screenshots submitted with the Complaint show recruitment communications directing recipients to a Microsoft Teams interview and identifying "[…]@ivecogroupusa.com" as a Teams contact. Several reports from prospective applicants specifically refer to that email address, question the authenticity of the purported offers, and describe requests for identification or tax information. The Complainant denies authorizing these communications.

The Complainant's representative sent a cease-and-desist letter through the Registrar's contact form on October 7, 2026, and submitted an abuse report to the Registrar on October 8, 2026.

[1] The local part of the email address has been redacted because it identifies the individual impersonated in the fraudulent communications. The Panel considers this limited redaction appropriate under paragraph 4(j) of the Policy and paragraph 16(b) of the Rules to avoid further identifying that individual in connection with the fraud. The complete address appears in the case record. For comparable redaction of impersonating email addresses, see *BLACKROCK FINANCE, INC. v. Bob Osullivan,* WIPO Case No. D2025-2940, and *Rape Abuse & Incest National Network (RAINN) v. Yew Rosing*, WIPO Case No. D2025-1884.

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. It submits that its IVECO and IVECO GROUP marks remain recognizable in the disputed domain name, notwithstanding the additional terms "group" and/or "usa". It denies granting the Respondent any permission to use those marks and submits that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further submits that the disputed domain name has been used to impersonate a member of its human resources staff and solicit personal information and documents from prospective job applicants. It relies on that conduct, the prior reputation of its marks, the disputed domain name's composition, and the registrant information to establish bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In the absence of a Response, the Panel proceeds to a decision on the basis of the Complaint and the evidence submitted, in accordance with paragraphs 5(f), 14(a), and 15(a) of the Rules, and may draw such inferences from the Respondent's default as it considers appropriate under paragraph 14(b) of the Rules. The Complainant must nevertheless establish each of the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy on the balance of probabilities. The Respondent's default does not by itself establish the Complainant's case or constitute an admission of its allegations. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), sections 4.2 and 4.3.

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 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, the term "usa" which may refer to the geographical term "United States of America" for the trademark IVECO GROUP and the terms "group" and "usa" for the trademark IVECO, 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.

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.

In particular, the email sent on September 25, 2026, and the corroborating reports expressly identify an email address using the disputed domain name. The communications reproduce the group's branding and seek identification documents or personal information under the guise of recruitment. On the available evidence, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been used for deceptive impersonation and phishing. Such use cannot confer rights or legitimate interests. 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.

The Complainant's trademark rights substantially predate the registration of the disputed domain name. Its composition, combining IVECO GROUP trademark with a geographical reference, and the recruitment email sent only two days after registration, displaying the group's logo and purporting to originate from its human resources staff, establish on the balance of probabilities that the Respondent knew of and deliberately targeted the Complainant and its marks when registering the disputed domain name.

The same evidence establishes bad faith use. The disputed domain name was used to give purported recruitment communications an appearance of authenticity and induce prospective applicants to disclose sensitive information and documents. This finding rests on the communications and corroborating reports, rather than merely on the existence of MX and SPF records.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances evidencing bad faith. The Panel need not determine whether any applicant actually disclosed information, suffered a financial loss, or made a payment. The documented use of the disputed domain name for impersonation and phishing is itself sufficient to establish bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. See also *Niantic, Inc. v. Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf / Redde reddy*, WIPO Case No. D2021-3801.

The use of an email address associated with the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant's staff is also consistent with the circumstances considered in *HMS Industrial Networks AB v. Steve Moore*, WIPO Case No. D2026-1418. The lack of a substantive website does not negate the active email use established in this case.

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 <ivecogroupusa.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Alexandre Nappey/
Alexandre Nappey
Sole Panelist
Date: October 30, 2026