

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-103948

Case number	CAC-UDRP-103948
Time of filing	2021-07-30 09:13:39
Domain names	INTESASANPAOLO.SHOP

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Intesa Sanpaolo S.p.A.
--------------	-------------------------------

Complainant representative

Organization	Intesa Sanpaolo S.p.A.
--------------	-------------------------------

Respondent

Name	Clinton Johnson
------	------------------------

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings which are pending or decided and which relate to the disputed domain name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant is inter alia the owner of the Community trademark registration no. 5301999 "INTESA SANPAOLO", registered on June 18, 2007, for various services in classes 35, 36, and 38 (hereinafter referred to as the "Trademark").

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a leading Italian banking group. It 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. The Complainant has a market capitalization exceeding 45,3 billion Euro, provides its services approximately to 13,5 million customers, and is the leader in Italy with a network of approximately 4,700 branches and a market share of more than 19% in most Italian regions.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 23, 2021, and is used in connection with a parking website provided by the Registrar, which includes sponsoring links related to banking and financial services.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

PARTIES' CONTENTIONS:

COMPLAINANT:

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark and that the present case is a clear case of typosquatting.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In this regard, the Complainant states that the Respondent is not authorized or licensed to use the Trademark. In addition, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name does not correspond to the Respondent's name, that the Respondent is not commonly known as "INTESASANPALO", and that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name is neither non-commercial nor fair.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In this regard, the Complainant contends that the Trademark is widely known and highly distinctive, that the present case is a clear case of typosquatting, and that the use of misspellings in domain names indicates bad faith registration. The Complainant also states that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent's web site or location or of a product or service on Respondent's web site or location.

RESPONDENT:

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

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the following three elements is present:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

1. The Panel accepts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark as it fully incorporates the well-

established Trademark despite the letter "O" in the last part of the second-level domain name. This is a clear case of typosquatting and the disputed domain name is nearly identical and confusingly similar to the Trademark.

2. The Complainant has substantiated that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that the Complainant has fulfilled its obligations under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. The Respondent did not deny these assertions in any way and therefore failed to prove any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Based on the evidence before the Panel, the Panel cannot find any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent either. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has proven that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name under paragraphs 4(a)(ii) and 4(c) of the Policy.

3. The Panel is also satisfied that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant and its rights in the Trademark as the Trademark is highly distinctive and the disputed domain name obviously reflects a typo of the Trademark, which indicates that the disputed domain name was registered having the Complainant and the Trademark in mind.

As to bad faith use, by using the disputed domain name in connection with a landing page providing pay-per-click links which promote third parties' products and services, the Respondent was, in all likelihood, trying to divert traffic intended for the Complainant's website to its own for commercial gain as set out under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. It is well established that a respondent (as the registered owner of the domain name) is in general ultimately responsible for the information available at the website and for all content posted there, regardless of how and by whom such content was generated and regardless of who profits directly from the commercial use.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **INTESASANPALO.SHOP**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Peter Müller
------	---------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2021-08-30

Publish the Decision
