

PANEL DECISION

Cassina S.p.A. v. ITtrust Domain Service LTD
Case No. DEU2026-0016

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Cassina S.p.A., Italy, represented by Convey Srl, Italy.

The Respondent is ITtrust Domain Service LTD, Ireland.

2. The Domain Name, Registry and Registrar

The Registry of the disputed domain name <cassina.eu> is the European Registry for Internet Domains ("EURid" or the "Registry"). The Registrar of the disputed domain name is IONOS SE.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 15, 2026. On April 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registry a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 17, 2026, the Registry 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 verified that the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .eu Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules (the "ADR Rules") and the World Intellectual Property Organization Supplemental Rules for .eu Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules (the "Supplemental Rules").

In accordance with the ADR Rules, Paragraph B (2), the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 28, 2026. In accordance with the ADR Rules, Paragraph B(3), the due date for Response was May 18, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Petra Pecar as the sole panelist in this matter on May 26, 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 ADR Rules, Paragraph B(5).

4. Factual Background

The Complainant was established in 1927 in Meda, Italy. The Complainant is active in the field of high-end furniture and industrial design, combining innovation, technology and traditional craftsmanship.

The Complainant is the owner of the registered marks, protecting term CASSINA, including the

European Union figurative mark  registration No. 004837829, Registered on October 29, 2007 for goods and services in International Classes 20 and 35.

The Complainant registered several domain names consisting of or comprising the CASSINA mark, including <cassina.com>, registered on September 10, 2003, and <cassina.it>, registered on April 3, 1997. The Complainant uses these domain names, its website and social media accounts to promote and sell its products online.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 14, 2019 and, at the time of filing the Complaint, resolved to a parking page, namely a static webpage of a company providing various web hosting services.

After becoming aware of the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed Domain Name, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter on March 20, 2026, to which the Respondent did not reply.

The Respondent is a legal entity from Ireland.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to its CASSINA mark, as it incorporates the mark in its entirety, with the ".eu" country code Top Level Domain ("ccTLD"). The Complainant also contends that the CASSINA mark is distinctive, as it derives from the surname of the company's founders, and that there is no plausible reason for the Respondent to have registered the disputed domain name by chance.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, as the Respondent is not authorized, licensed or otherwise permitted to use the CASSINA mark and is not commonly known by that name. The disputed domain name has not been used for a bona fide offering of goods or services, but only resolved to a static webpage of a company providing web hosting services, with no disclaimer or indication of any legitimate relationship with the Complainant.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In particular, the Complainant points to the distinctive and well-known character of the CASSINA mark, the Respondent's passive holding of the disputed domain name, its resolution to a parking page, the Respondent's pattern of trademark-abusive registrations and prior adverse panel decisions, and its failure to reply to the cease-and-desist letter.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Even if the Respondent did not file a Response to the Complainant's contentions, the Panel shall consider the issues present in the case based on the statements and documents submitted by the Complainant. "The Panel shall decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the ADR Rules", as indicated in paragraph B(11)(a) of the ADR Rules.

Under paragraph B(11)(d) of the ADR Rules, the Complainant is required to prove each of the following three elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a name in respect of which a right is recognized or established by the national law of a Member State and/or European Union law and; either
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; or
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered or is being used by the Respondent in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar to a name in respect of which a right or rights are recognized or established by national law of a Member State and/or European Union law

Paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(i) of the ADR Rules requires a complainant to show that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a name in respect of which a right is recognized or established by the national law of a Member State and/or European Union law. A trademark registration is generally sufficient to establish such rights.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established its rights in the CASSINA mark based on the European Union registration.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name incorporates the CASSINA mark in its entirety. The addition of the ccTLD ".eu" does not affect the finding of confusing similarity, in accordance with well-established Panel practice.

In light of the above, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(i) of the ADR Rules by establishing its rights in the CASSINA mark and showing that the disputed domain name is identical to that mark.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under the second element of the ADR Rules, the Complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Once such prima facie case is made, the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence to rebut that presumption. If the Respondent fails to do so, the Complainant is generally deemed to have satisfied the second element under paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(ii) of the ADR Rules.

The Respondent has failed to provide any evidence of authorization to use the CASSINA mark or to register a domain name containing that mark. According to the Complainant, the Respondent is not associated or connected with the Complainant in any way, and the Complainant has not granted the Respondent any license or authorization to use or register any domain name incorporating the Complainant's CASSINA mark.

The Respondent has also failed to submit a Response and has therefore not presented any circumstances that could establish rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. There is also no evidence of any legitimate or bona fide use of the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the nature of the disputed domain name, which consists of the Complainant's CASSINA mark, carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant and therefore cannot constitute fair use.

Based on the above, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(ii) of the ADR Rules.

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

The third element of paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(iii) of the ADR Rules requires the Complainant to demonstrate that the disputed domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

Paragraph B(11)(f) of the ADR Rules provides that certain circumstances may be considered as evidence of the registration or use of a domain name in bad faith, including where the domain name has been registered in order to prevent the holder of a name in respect of which a right is recognized or established by national and/or European Union law from reflecting this name in a corresponding domain name.

The Panel finds that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its CASSINA mark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. The Panel notes in particular the distinctive character of the CASSINA mark, the Complainant's longstanding mark rights, and the fact that a simple Internet search for "Cassina" would have revealed the Complainant and its rights.

As to use in bad faith, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name resolved to a parking page operated by Fasthosts, displaying the message "Welcome to cassina.eu" and stating that the domain name is parked for free. The page also included options relating to buying a similar domain name and web hosting services.

The Panel also notes that the Respondent has been involved in several prior .eu ADR proceedings decided against them. This supports the conclusion that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of registering domain names corresponding to third-party marks, which further indicates bad faith. The Panel also takes into account the Respondent's failure to reply to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter and the absence of any evidence suggesting a good faith use of the disputed domain name.

For these reasons, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith in accordance with paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(iii) of the ADR Rules.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with Paragraph B(11) of the ADR Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name, <cassina.eu> be transferred to the Complainant.¹

/Petra Pecar/

Petra Pecar

Sole Panelist

Date: June 9, 2026

¹As the Complainant established in Italy, which is the Member State of the European Union it satisfies the general eligibility criteria for registration of the disputed domain name set out in Article 3 of Regulation (EU) 2019/517. The decision shall be implemented by the Registry within thirty (30) days after the notification of the decision to the Parties, unless the Respondent initiates court proceedings in a Mutual Jurisdiction, as defined in Paragraph A(1) of the ADR Rules.