

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-102775

Case number CAC-UDRP-102775

Time of filing 2019-11-14 09:11:07

Domain names intesasanpolo.xyz

Case administrator

Organization Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization Intesa Sanpaolo S.p.A.

Complainant representative

Organization Perani Pozzi Associati

Respondent

Name Andreew Josua

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

No other legal proceedings are currently pending or decided, which relate to the disputed domain name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

-International trademark registration n. 920896 "INTESA SANPAOLO", granted on March 7, 2007 and duly renewed, in class 36, also covering the United States of America;

-International trademark registration n. 924099 "INTESA SANPAOLO & device", granted on March 27, 2007 and duly renewed, in class 36, also covering the United States of America;

- International trademark registration n. 793367 "INTESA", granted on September 4, 2002 and duly renewed, in connection with class 36;

- EU trademark registration n. 5301999 "INTESA SANPAOLO", applied on September 8, 2006, granted on June 18, 2007 and duly renewed, in classes 35, 36 and 38;

- EU trademark registration n. 12247979 "INTESA", filed on October 23, 2013 and granted on March 5, 2014, in connection with classes 9, 16, 35, 36 38, 41 and 42.

FACTS ASSERTED BY THE COMPLAINANT AND NOT CONTESTED BY THE RESPONDENT:

THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME IS IDENTICAL OR CONFUSINGLY SIMILAR TO A TRADEMARK OR SERVICE MARK IN WHICH THE COMPLAINANT HAS RIGHTS

The Complainant is an Italian banking group. Intesa Sanpaolo is the company resulting from the merger (effective as of January 1, 2007) between Banca Intesa S.p.A. and Sanpaolo IMI S.p.A., two Italian banking groups.

Intesa Sanpaolo has a market capitalisation exceeding 38,1 billion euro. With a network of approximately 3,900 branches capillary and well distributed throughout the Country, and market shares of more than 16 % in most Italian regions, the Group offers its services to approximately 11,8 million customers. Intesa Sanpaolo has a strong presence in Central-Eastern Europe with a network of approximately 1.100 branches and over 7,2 million customers. Moreover, the international network specialised in supporting corporate customers is present in 25 countries, in particular in the Mediterranean area and those areas where Italian companies are most active, such as the United States, Russia, China and India.

The Complainant is the owner, among others, of the following registrations for the trademarks "INTESA SANPAOLO" and "INTESA".

The Complainant is also the owner, among the others, of the following domain names bearing the signs "INTESA SANPAOLO" and "INTESA": INTESASANPAOLO.COM, .ORG, .EU, .INFO, .NET, .BIZ, INTESA-SANPAOLO.COM, .ORG, .EU, .INFO, .NET, .BIZ and INTESA.COM, INTESA.INFO, INTESA.BIZ, INTESA.ORG, INTESA.US, INTESA.EU, INTESA.CN, INTESA.IN, INTESA.CO.UK, INTESA.TEL, INTESA.NAME, INTESA.XXX, INTESA.ME. All of them are now connected to the official website www.intesasanpaolo.com.

On October 28, 2018, the Respondent registered the domain name <INTESASANPOLO.XYZ>.

The disputed domain name is identical, or – at least – confusingly similar, to the Complainant's trademarks "INTESA SANPAOLO" and "INTESA". <INTESASANPOLO.XYZ> reproduces the well-known trademark "INTESA SANPAOLO", with the mere omission of the letter "A" in the mark's verbal portion "PAOLO". This qualifies as typosquatting.

In support of the above, the Complainant wishes to draw the Panel's attention to WIPO decision Deutsche Bank Aktiengesellschaft v New York TV Tickets Inc, Case n. D2001-1314 – regarding the domain names <duetschebank.com> and <duetsche-bank.com>. The Panel considered such domain names as being confusingly similar and a clear example of "a case of 'typosquatting' where the domain name is a slight alphabetical variation from a famous mark. WIPO jurisprudence offers many examples of confusing similarity brought about through easily made typing errors by an Internet user – particularly when the mark is another language from that of the user's mother tongue." The same applies in this matter.

THE RESPONDENT HAS NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS IN RESPECT OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME

The Respondent has no rights on the disputed domain name, and any use of the trademarks "INTESA SANPAOLO" and "INTESA" has to be authorized by the Complainant. Nobody has been authorized or licensed by the above-mentioned banking group to use the domain name at issue.

The disputed domain name does not correspond to the name of the Respondent and, to the best of our knowledge, the Respondent is not commonly known as "INTESASANPOLO".

Lastly, we do not find any fair or non-commercial uses of the disputed domain name.

THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME WAS REGISTERED AND IS USED IN BAD FAITH

The Complainant's trademarks "INTESA SANPAOLO" and "INTESA" are distinctive and well known all around the world. The fact that the Respondent has registered a domain name that is confusingly similar to them indicates that the Respondent had knowledge of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. In addition, if the Respondent had carried out even a basic online search engine search in respect of the wordings "INTESA SANPAOLO" and "INTESA", the same would have yielded obvious references to the Complainant. The Complainant submitted an extract of an online search query in support of its allegation. This raises a clear inference of knowledge of the Complainant's trademark on the part of the Respondent. Therefore, it is more than likely that the disputed domain name would not have been registered if it were not for Complainant's trademark. This is a clear evidence of registration of a domain name in bad faith.

In addition, the disputed domain name is not used for any bone fide offerings. There are present circumstances indicating that the Respondent has registered or acquired the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the disputed domain name registration to the Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name (par. 4(b)(i) of the Policy).

The disputed domain name is not used for any bone fide offerings, even if it is not connected to any website, by now. In several UDRP decisions it has been confirmed that the passive holding of a domain name with knowledge that the domain name infringes another party's trademark rights is evidence of bad faith registration and use.

Passive holding of a domain name may, in appropriate circumstances, be consistent with a finding of bad faith. However, panels have tended to make such findings in circumstances in which, for example, a complainant's mark is well-known, and there is no conceivable use that could be made of the domain name that would not amount to an infringement of the complainant's trade mark rights.

As regards to the first aspect, the Complainant has already extensively proved the renowned of its trademarks. For what concern the second circumstance, it must be underlined that it is objectively not possible to understand what kind of use the Respondent could make with a domain name which does exactly correspond to the Complainant's trademarks and that results so similar to the Complainant's domain names currently used by the latter to provide online banking services for enterprises.

In the light of the above, the passive holding of the disputed domain name has to be considered a use in bad faith: «The very act of having acquired [the domain name] raises the probability of Respondent using [it] in a manner that is contrary to Complainant's legal rights and legitimate interests. [...]

To argue that Complainant should have to wait for some future use of the disputed domain name to occur in order to demonstrate Respondent's bad faith use is to render intellectual property law into an instrument of abuse by the Respondent. The result would be the likelihood of the accumulation and use of disputed domain name for the implicit, if not explicit, purpose of misappropriating or otherwise unlawfully undermining Complainant's goodwill and business. The fact that this misappropriation may occur in any as yet undetermined manner at an uncertain future date does not negate Respondent's bad faith. On the contrary, it raises the specter of continuing bad faith abuse by Respondent of Complainant's Mark, name and related rights and legitimate business interests» (Decision No. D2004-0615, Comerica Inc. v. Horoshiy, Inc., concerning just the case of a bank).

The risk of a wrongful use of the disputed domain name is high in the present case, since the Complainant has already been targeted by some cases of phishing in the past few years. Such a practice consists of attracting the customers of a bank to a web page which imitates the real page of the bank, with a view to having customers disclose confidential information like a credit card or bank account number, for the purpose of unlawfully charging such bank accounts or withdrawing money out of them. It happened that some clients of the Complainant have received e-mail messages asking, by the means of web pages which were very similar to the Complainant's ones, the sensitive data of the Clients, like user ID, password etc. Then, some of the Clients have been cheated of their savings.

Also in the present case, the Complainant believes that the current owner registered the disputed domain name with the “phishing” purpose, in order to induce and divert the Complainant’s legitimate customers to its website and steal their money and the above could be easily verified given the particular nature of the disputed domain name (typosquatting).

Even excluding any “phishing” purposes or other illicit use of the disputed domain name in the present case, anyway we could find no other possible legitimate use of <INTESASANPOLO.XYZ>. The sole further aim of the owner of the domain name under consideration might be to resell it to the Complainant, which represents, in any case, an evidence of the registration and use in bad faith, according to par. 4(b)(i) («circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name»).

Lastly, it shall be noted that on January 11, 2019 the Complainant’s attorneys sent to the Respondent a cease and desist letter, asking for the voluntary transfer of the domain name at issue. Despite such communication, the Respondent did not comply with the above request.

In the light of the above, the third and final element necessary for finding that the Respondent has engaged in abusive domain name registration and use has been established.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

NO ADMINISTRATIVELY COMPLIANT RESPONSE HAS BEEN FILED.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Respondent to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

The Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under UDRP were met and there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to:

- EU trademark registration n. 5301999 “INTESA SANPAOLO”, applied on September 8, 2006, granted on June 18, 2007 and duly renewed, in classes 35, 36 and 38;

-International trademark registration n. 920896 “INTESA SANPAOLO”, granted on March 7, 2007 and duly renewed, in class 36, also covering the United States of America;

-International trademark registration n. 924099 "INTESA SANPAOLO & device", granted on March 27, 2007 and duly renewed, in class 36, also covering the United States of America.

The Respondent has no rights on the disputed domain name, and any use of the trademarks "INTESA SANPAOLO".

The disputed domain name was registered and is used in bad faith. The Complainant's trademarks "INTESA SANPAOLO" and "INTESA" are distinctive and well known all around the world. The Respondent has registered a domain name that is confusingly similar to them indicates that the Respondent had knowledge of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

AND THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME(S) IS (ARE) TO BE

1. INTESASANPOLO.XYZ: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Mr. E.J.V.T. van den Broek
------	----------------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION	2020-01-08
------------------------	------------

Publish the Decision