

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Skorpio Limited, v. Reimann ANITA

Case No. DRO2026-0011

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Skorpio Limited, Switzerland, represented by Keltie LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Reimann ANITA, Germany.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <rickowens.ro> is registered via ROTLD (the “Registry”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 11, 2026, 2026. On June 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 17, 2026, the Registry 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 (Private Individual, GDPR Protected) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 19, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registry, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on June 22, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .RO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy”) the Rules for .RO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .RO 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 June 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 13, 2026. The Respondent did not submit a Response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Delia-Mihaela Belciu as the sole panelist in this matter on July 24, 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 a Swiss company that manages the intellectual property rights of the fashion designer Rick Owens.

The Complainant is the owner of the following RICK OWENS trademark registrations:

- the European Union Trade Mark No. 018510789 for RICK OWENS, registered on March 10, 2022, for goods and services in classes 3, 9, 14, 18, 25, and 42;
- the European Union Trade Mark No. 002493294 for RICK OWENS, registered on May 21, 2003, for goods in classes 3, 9, 14, 18 and 25.

The disputed domain name <rickowens.ro> was registered on December 5, 2025, and, according to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, resolved to an active webpage offering for sale clothing and footwear under the RICK OWENS trademark.

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:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's RICK OWENS trademark, as it incorporates it in its entirety, followed by the country code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD"), "ro", which is to be disregarded for the purpose of the comparison;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name for a number of reasons, among which that: (1) the Complainant's RICK OWENS trademark is highly distinctive and famous in the fashion industry, (2) the Complainant has never licensed or authorized the Respondent to use its trademark nor to register the disputed domain name, (3) there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, that it makes a bona fide offering of goods or services or that is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, (4) the Respondent is not an authorized reseller or distributor of the Complainant;
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith for various reasons, including that (1) the disputed domain name was registered long after the registration of the Complainant's RICK OWENS trademarks, (2) the website to which the disputed domain name resolved was offering for sale clothing and footwear under the RICK OWENS trademark.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In order for the Complainant to succeed, such must prove, according to paragraph 3 of the Rules and paragraph 4 of the Policy, that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a (i) trademark or service mark or (ii) with a geographical indication protected in Romania or by European Union law in which the complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

In case all three elements above have been fulfilled, the Panel is able to grant the remedy requested by the Complainant. Thus, the Panel will deal with each of the requirements in turn.

Given the similarities between the Policy, the Rules and the UDRP Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “UDRP Policy”), the Panel will consider both the decisions rendered under the UDRP Policy and the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)), in the assessment of the present case.

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 identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Concerning the addition of the ccTLD “.ro” in relation to the disputed domain name, such is viewed as a standard registration requirement, and is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that 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 .RO 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.

Based on the available evidence, the Respondent does not appear to be commonly known by the name "rickowens".

The Complainant has not licensed or authorized the Respondent to use its RICK OWENS trademark, nor to register the disputed domain name. Based on the evidence filed by the Complainant, the Respondent is not an authorized reseller or distributor of the Complainant.

Moreover, based on the evidence filed by the Complainant, the disputed domain name resolved to a website that was offering for sale clothing and footwear under the RICK OWENS trademark, without any authorisation from the Complainant.

Furthermore, the composition of the disputed domain name, incorporating in its entirety the Complainant's RICK OWENS trademark, combined with the content on the website to which the disputed domain name resolved, carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

All the above does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services, or to a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered or 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 or use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant's rights in the RICK OWENS trademark predate the registration date of the disputed domain name.

In light of the above as well as of the distinctive character of the RICK OWENS mark, the Panel finds that it is not conceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's RICK OWENS mark, which supports a finding of bad faith registration. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

Although the condition of the use of the disputed domain name in bad faith is not necessary to be further analyzed, given the alternative nature of this condition, the Panel notes that, the disputed domain name incorporates in its entirety the Complainant's RICK OWENS trademark, while the disputed domain name resolved to a website which was offering for sale clothing and footwear under the RICK OWENS trademark, which suggests that the Respondent intended to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the disputed domain name, creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its trademark, aspects which support a finding of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.1.4.

Therefore, the Panel considers that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith and in addition, although not necessary to be further analyzed, the Panel also finds that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith, and that the third element of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy is met.

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 <rickowens.ro> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Delia-Mihaela Belciu/

Delia-Mihaela Belciu

Sole Panelist

Date: August 7, 2026