

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

PANZANI v. Jac James, Jacj LLC

Case No. DCC2025-0021

1. The Parties

The Complainant is PANZANI, France, represented by Cabinet Germain & Maureau, France.

The Respondent is Jac James, Jacj LLC, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <panzani.cc> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 28, 2025. On October 29, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 30, 2025, 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 October 31, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint confirming the disclosed registrant information on November 12, 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 November 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 7, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 8, 2025.

The Center appointed Douglas Clark as the sole panelist in this matter on December 15, 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 a French single-shareholder simplified joint-stock company. It was founded by Mr. Giovanni Panzani, who established the brand PASTA PANZANI in the 1950s. Over the years it has become one of the largest pasta producers in Europe. At present, the Complainant handles approximately 37% of national pasta sales by volume in the French market and generates an annual turnover exceeding EUR 600 million. The Complainant engages primarily in the production and distribution of pasta, sauces, and semolina.

The Complainant is the registered proprietor of the following trademarks for PANZANI.

PANZANI (wordmark), French Registration. No. 1247001 in classes 5, 29, 30, 31, 32 and 33 registered on September 28, 1993.

PANZANI (wordmark), International Trademark Reg. No. 403862 in classes 5, 29, 30, 31, 32 and 33 registered on November 22, 1973, designating inter alia:

Algeria, Armenia, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Benelux, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Egypt, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Madagascar, Moldova, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan.

The Respondent is an individual and/or a purported limited liability company. It provides an address in the United States of America.

The Complainant first became aware of the disputed domain name following a fraudulent email communication that was brought to its attention.

The Respondent utilized an email address associated with the disputed domain name for the purpose of deceiving a third party doing business with the Complainant, by attempting to fraudulently obtain funds from such third party. The fraudulent email address used by the Respondent – “[...]@panzani.cc” - was designed to mimic the Complainant’s genuine corporate address, “[...]@panzani.fr”, differing only in the Top-Level Domain (“TLD”).

The Respondent also altered a pro forma invoice and produced a falsified document entitled “Bank Account Change Declaration”, which unlawfully reproduced the PANZANI word mark and was transmitted to the third party as part of the fraudulent scheme to attempt to have the third party pay money to this account.

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.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

This is a clear case of abuse of the domain name system that the UDRP was designed to stop.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The first of the Policy 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 the trademark PANZANI for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 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.

The Panel finds the Complainant has clearly established a case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The use of a domain name for illegal activity, here, a clear attempt at fraud by impersonating the Complainant 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.

The use of a domain name for illegal activity, here, a clear attempt at fraud by impersonating the Complainant constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. The disputed domain name was clearly registered with a fraudulent purpose in mind. 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 <panzani.cc> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Douglas Clark/
Douglas Clark
Sole Panelist
Date: December 30, 2025*