

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bulgari S.p.A v. Giuseppe Daniele
Case No. DCC2025-0019

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Bulgari S.p.A, Italy, represented by SafeNames Ltd., United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Giuseppe Daniele, Italy.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bulgarireplica.cc> is registered with Center of Ukrainian Internet Names (UKRNames) (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 22, 2025. On September 23, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 26, 2025, 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 (Vyacheslav Smirnov, Virtual systems) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 30, 2025, 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 October 1, 2025.

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 October 7, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 27, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 31, 2025.

The Center appointed Andrea Cappai as the sole panelist in this matter on November 5, 2025. 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 Bulgari S.p.A., an Italian luxury goods company founded in 1884 and headquartered in Rome. Over the course of more than a century, the Complainant has developed a global reputation for high-end products and services, particularly jewellery. It operates more than 320 retail locations worldwide, as well as a network of hotels in major international cities.

The Complainant maintains a strong online presence through its official domain name <bulgari.com>, registered in 1998, which resolves to its global website. The Complainant's BVLGARI and BULGARI trademarks also enjoy extensive visibility across social media platforms, with millions of followers on Facebook, Instagram, X (Twitter), and TikTok.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for BVLGARI and BULGARI in multiple jurisdictions. By way of example, the record includes:

- BULGARI – International Registration No. 452694, registered on May 15, 1980
- BULGARI – Chinese Registration No. 341625, registered on March 10, 1989
- BVLGARI – European Union Registration No. 007138101, registered on June 3, 2009

The disputed domain name was registered on March 19, 2025. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name resolved to an online shop displaying what appeared to be replicas of the Complainant's products. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name no longer resolves to an active website.

No information is available regarding the Respondent beyond the contact details disclosed by the Registrar.

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 it holds longstanding trademark rights in the marks BVLGARI and BULGARI, and that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to those marks because it incorporates the BULGARI mark in full. The addition of the term "replica" does not avoid a finding of confusing similarity, and the addition of the Top-Level Domain ".cc" is irrelevant for the assessment.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. It explains that it has not authorised the Respondent to use its marks, nor is the Respondent commonly known by the term "Bulgari" or the disputed domain name. Rather, the disputed domain name resolved to a fraudulent website styled as an official Bulgari shop, displaying product images without permission and offering what appears to be replicas of the Complainant's jewellery, while inviting users to provide personal and payment information. The Complainant submits that such impersonation cannot amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor to legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

As to bad faith, the Complainant argues that its marks have been well known for decades and that even minimal diligence would have revealed its extensive rights. The combination of the BULGARI mark with the term "replica" is said to indicate an intent to exploit the Complainant's reputation. The use of the disputed

domain name for a website imitating the Complainant's own, offering alleged replicas and requesting personal data without any disclaimer, is presented as further evidence of deliberate targeting. In the Complainant's view, these circumstances show that the disputed domain name was both registered and used in bad faith under the Policy.

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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the BULGARI 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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "replica", 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 3.0](#), 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 recognised 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 3.0](#), 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.

The record indicates that the Respondent was never authorised to use the Complainant's marks, and there is no evidence suggesting that the Respondent is commonly known by the term "Bulgari" or any similar

designation. The disputed domain name previously resolved to a website made to look like an official Bulgari online shop, displaying product images without authorisation and offering what appears to be replicas of the Complainant's jewellery. Users were prompted to provide personal and payment information at checkout. Such fraudulent activity does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor legitimate noncommercial or fair use under the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for the alleged sale of counterfeit goods can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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 Respondent registered the disputed domain name that reproduces the Complainant's mark in its entirety together with the term "replica". The Complainant's mark is well known in the luxury sector, and its notoriety has been recognised in prior UDRP decisions. In these circumstances, and given the distinctiveness of the mark, it is not credible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration. Panels have consistently held that the registration of a domain name identical or confusingly similar to a widely-known mark by an unaffiliated party gives rise to a presumption of bad faith ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4).

Bad faith is reinforced by the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name. The record shows that it resolved to a website imitating the Complainant's official online shop, displaying product images without authorisation and offering what appear to be replicas of the Complainant's jewellery, while inviting users to submit personal and payment details. Such conduct falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, as it seeks to attract users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, affiliation, or endorsement. The absence of any disclaimer only heightens the risk of deception.

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 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for the alleged sale of counterfeit goods constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. 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 <bulgarireplica.cc> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Cappai/

Andrea Cappai

Sole Panelist

Date: November 19, 2025