

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-105384

Case number	CAC-UDRP-105384
Time of filing	2023-04-24 10:29:05
Domain names	stoneislandaustralia.org, xn--stoneislandbelgi-prb.com, stoneislandbelgique.org, stoneislandbrasil.com, stoneislandbulgaria.com, stoneislandcanada.org, stoneislanddenmark.org, stoneislandeesti.com, stoneislandgreece.com, stoneislandhrvatska.com, stoneislandireland.org, stoneislandisrael.com, stoneislandjapan.com, stoneislandlatvia.com, stoneislandlietuva.com, xn--stoneislandmxico-mqb.com, stoneislandmagyarorszag.com, stoneislandnederland.com, stoneislandnorge.org, stoneislandportugal.com, stoneislandromania.com, stoneislandschweiz.com, stoneislandslovenija.com, stoneislandsouthafrica.org, stoneislandspain.com, stoneislandsrbija.com, stoneislandsuomi.org, stoneislandturkiye.com, stoneislanduae.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Dvořáková (Case admin)
------	-----------------------------

Complainant

Organization	MONCLER S.P.A.
--------------	----------------

Complainant representative

Organization	Convey srl
--------------	------------

RESPONDENTS

Organization	Whois protection, this company does not own this domain name s.r.o.
Name	Spencer Parker Greconive81
Name	Tyler Parkinson Favelf
Name	Harrison Bolton Dismithey
Name	Jasmine Dunn Gras1974
Name	Abby Cunningham Pribill
Name	Louis Archer Appere1996
Name	Maya Griffin Revey1951
Name	Freddie Rahman Evelt1937
Name	Madison Moran Horged1990

Name	Sean Turner Frou 1978
Name	Thomas Wade Best
Name	Melissa Brooks Hiver ced
Name	Imogen Noble A ited
Name	Tegan Hughes Or therce
Name	Evan Riley Suld 1974
Name	Ellis Gibbs Kild 1972
Name	Jennifer Little Q uidents
Name	Elliot Doherty D efter
Name	Louis Whittaker A gireve
Name	Isabella Joyce But tp2002
Name	Georgina Reynolds C oord1981
Name	Sam Sanders Your pred
Name	Alisha Jenkins M othat
Name	Hayden Gibbs W ousidersing
Name	Leah Warren wue 4ZieTai
Name	Patrick Godfrey C hattent
Name	Brooke Hodgson M oothoung
Name	Harrison Fox Act ly1984

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is unaware of any other pending or decided legal proceedings relating to the disputed domain names.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant is the owner of the trademark STONE ISLAND since 2020 through various corporate moves, however, the trademarks related to this matter antecede the acquisition of the rights by the Complainant. The trademarks in question include the following:

- INT. TM n. 510222 on February 13, 1987 for “STONE ISLAND”;
- INT. TM n. 709042 on February 02, 1999 for “STONE ISLAND”;
- INT. TM n. 873957 on November 07, 2005 for “STONE ISLAND”;
- EU TM n. 003785995 on September 02, 2005 for “STONE ISLAND”;
- EU TM n. 003785953 on September 02, 2005 for “STONE ISLAND”.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The disputed domain names are:

Domain name	Date of Registration	Registrant
stoneislandaustralia.org	March 8, 2023	Chelsea Ashton Facce1966
xn--stoneislandbelgi-prb.com	March 8, 2023	Spencer Parker Grecenive81
stoneislandbelgique.org	March 8, 2023	Tyler Parkinson Favelf
stoneislandbrasil.com	March 8, 2023	Harrison Bolton Dismithey
stoneislandbulgaria.com	March 8, 2023	Jasmine Dunn Gras1974
stoneislandcanada.org	March 8, 2023	Abby Cunningham Pribill
stoneislanddenmark.org	March 8, 2023	Louis Archer Appere1996
stoneislandeesti.com	March 8, 2023	Maya Griffin Revey1951
stoneislandgreece.com	March 8, 2023	Freddie Rahman Evelf1937
stoneislandhrvatska.com	March 8, 2023	Madison Moran Horged1990
stoneislandireland.org	March 8, 2023	Sean Turner FROUT1978
stoneislandisrael.com	March 8, 2023	Thomas Wade Bestore
stoneislandjapan.com	March 8, 2023	Melissa Brooks Hiverced
stoneislandlatvia.com	March 8, 2023	Imogen Noble Amited
stoneislandlietuva.com	March 8, 2023	Tegan Hughes Ortherce
xn--stoneislandmxico-mqb.com	March 8, 2023	Evan Riley Suld1974
stoneislandmagyarorszag.com	March 8, 2023	Ellis Gibbs Kild1972
stoneislandnederland.com	March 8, 2023	Jennifer Little Quidents
stoneislandnorge.org	March 8, 2023	Elliot Doherty Defter
stoneislandportugal.com	March 8, 2023	Louis Whittaker Agireve
stoneislandromania.com	March 8, 2023	Isabella Joyce Buttp2002

stoneislandschweiz.com	March 8, 2023	Georgina Reynolds Coord1981
stoneislandslovenija.com	March 8, 2023	Sam Sanders Yourpred
stoneislandsouthafrica.org	March 8, 2023	Alisha Jenkins Mothat
stoneislandspain.com	March 8, 2023	Hayden Gibbs Wousidersing
stoneislandsrbija.com	March 8, 2023	Leah Warren wue4ZieTai
stoneislandsuomi.org	March 8, 2023	Patrick Godfrey Chattent
stoneislandturkiye.com	March 8, 2023	Brooke Hodgson Moothoung
stoneislanduae.com	March 8, 2023	Harrison Fox Actly1984

Moncler S.p.A., hereinafter referred to as the Complainant, is an Italian luxury sport equipment manufacturer active in the sector in ready-to-wear outerwear headquartered in Milan, Italy.

The “STONE ISLAND” brand was established in 1982 in Italy by the Italian designer Massimo Osti, initially as a secondary line to complement his principal brand C.P. Company which he had started in 1971. In 1983 the company sold 50% of the brand to GFT (Gruppo Finanziario Tessile), which acquired the rest of the company in 1991. In 1993 GFT sold the company to Carlo Rivetti who also bought C.P. Company to form Sportswear Company S.p.A..

In August 2017, Singaporean Sovereign wealth fund Temasek Holdings bought a 30% stake of the “STONE ISLAND” brand. In December 2020, the Complainant acquired a majority stake in Stone Island for a reported €1.15 billion.

“STONE ISLAND” is known for its innovative approach to fabrication through a range of dyeing techniques and surface treatments. It is also recognizable by the use of a cloth badge that features a compass design and that buttons onto the upper sleeve of the left arm.

From the mid-1990s the make has been popular in the football casual subculture in England and throughout the rest of Europe. The brand is often associated with hooliganism and can be seen in many football hooliganism based movies, such as Green Street Hooligans and The Football Factory. Canadian rapper Drake, the American filmmaker Spike Lee and the British singer Zayn Malik are also regularly seen wearing Stone Island and they have helped popularize the brand in pop culture.

Therefore, the Complainant has spent considerable effort in promoting this mark, thereby acquiring the trademark’s goodwill.

In order to protect and promote its brand also on the Internet, the Complainant registered several domain names consisting of or comprising the trademark “STONE ISLAND” under several different TLDs, including <stoneisland.com>, which was registered on July 02, 1997, <stoneisland.it>, registered on November 27, 2002, < stoneisland.cn >, registered on January 25, 2007, < stoneisland.eu >, registered on April 04, 2006. The Complainant’s websites and Social Media accounts generate a significant number of visits by Internet users every day and are used by the Complainant to promote and also sell online its products.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

A. PRELIMINARY PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Pursuant to the rules, the Complainant brings to the Panel’s attention the evidences that the disputed domain names are subject to an evident common control, thus making the consolidation of the dispute equitable and procedurally efficient.

Furthermore, the Respondent uses the email “@cxtmail.com” for each email addresses under the registration contact details.

Accordingly, Complainant finds that the evidences provided, along with such further similarities emerged subsequent to the Registrar’s disclosure, are concrete and sufficient to prove that the disputed domain names are subject to a common control and asks the Panel for the consolidation of the disputed domain names in a single dispute, thus referring hereinafter to a unique “Respondent”.

The Complainant respectfully requests that the disputed domain names and the named Respondent be consolidated in a single UDRP proceeding.

In the case at hand the Complainant believes that the disputed domain names, which all incorporate the trademark "STONE ISLAND" in their entirety, are under the control of a single individual or entity or, at least, reflective of a group of individuals acting in concert.

It should be preliminarily noted that the disputed domain names share the following similarities:

- same registrar: Gransy s.r.o.
- same lay-out of the active websites: same favicons, same headers, same footers, same products offered for sale;
- same date of registration of the disputed domain names;
- presence of geographical terms associated to the Complainant's trademark in the domain

The disputed domain names were registered by the Respondent, without authorization of Complainant on March 8, 2023. They have been pointed to websites entirely dedicated to the sale of goods bearing the "STONE ISLAND" trademark and having similar layouts.

As soon as the Complainant became aware of the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names, confusingly similar to its registered and well-known trademark "STONE ISLAND", it instructed its representative to address to the Respondent a cease and desist letters in order to notify him of the infringement of the Complainant's trademark rights, requesting the immediate cease of any use and the transfer of the disputed domain names.

Therefore, cease and desist letter was sent to the Respondent's email indicated in the Whois of the disputed domain names on April 03, 2023.

In light of the absence of a reply and the failure to comply with the requests, the Complainant instructed its representative to file the present Complaint in order to obtain the transfer of the disputed domain names under its ownership and control.

B. THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAMES ARE IDENTICAL OR CONFUSINGLY SIMILAR

The disputed domain names registered by the Respondent are confusingly similar to trademarks in which Complainant has rights, as per copies of trademark registrations provided.

The disputed domain names incorporate the whole of the Complainant's trademark "STONE ISLAND" and the fact that they include a non-distinctive element such as geographical terms and the generic Top-Level Domain .com does not affect the confusing similarity.

It is a well-established principle that domain names that wholly incorporate trademarks, in particular one as famous as "STONE ISLAND", are found to be confusingly similar for the purposes of the Policy, despite the fact that the disputed domain names may also contain descriptive or generic terms.

It should be also noted that the geographical terms in the disputed domain names, while cannot be considered enough to distinguish the disputed domain names from the Complainant's mark, are all the more apt to induce confusion among Internet users. "STONE ISLAND" is, in fact, an internationally well-known mark in the sector of luxury apparels, and the Complainant's products are sold worldwide.

Furthermore, the top levels ".com" ".org" are merely instrumental to the use in Internet and not able to affect the confusing similarity of the disputed domain names to the Complainant's trademark.

In light of the above, the disputed domain names are certainly confusingly similar to the prior registered trademarks in which the Complainant has rights pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

C. RESPONDENT HAS NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTEREST IN RESPECT OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAMES

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the burden of proving the absence of the Respondent's rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names lies with the Complainant. It is nevertheless a well-settled principle that satisfying this burden is unduly onerous, since proving a negative fact is logically less feasible than establishing a positive. Accordingly, it is sufficient for the Complainant to produce prima facie evidence in order to shift the burden of production to the Respondent.

As a preliminary note, the mere registration of a domain name does not establish rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

The Respondent is not a licensee, authorized agent of the Complainant or in any other way authorized to use Complainant's trademarks. Specifically, the Respondent is not an authorized reseller of the Complainant and has not been authorized to the registration and use of the disputed domain names.

Upon information and belief, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names as individual, business or other organization and their family names do not correspond to "STONE ISLAND" or the disputed domain names.

The Respondent has not provided the Complainant with any evidence of the use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services before any notice of the dispute.

The disputed domain names have been redirected by the Respondent to websites with similar layouts where the Complainant's trademark "STONE ISLAND" are published and prima facie counterfeit "STONE ISLAND" branded products are offered for sale. In light of the following circumstances is evident that the goods offered for sale are counterfeit:

- the absence of disclaimers in the Respondent's websites;
- the Respondent has misappropriated copyrighted images from the Complainant's website;
- the Respondent has concealed his identity both on the whois and on the websites corresponding to the disputed domain names, where there are not emails and/or physical addresses to contact the Respondent.

In view of the abusive sale of counterfeit goods, the Oki Data Test - dedicated to resellers, distributors or service providers using a domain name containing the complainant's trademark to undertake sales related to the complainant's goods - is inapplicable to this case.

It is evident that the Respondent's use cannot be considered neither a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain names. Such wilful conduct clearly demonstrates, to the contrary, that Respondent did not intend to use the disputed domain names in connection with any legitimate purpose.

Furthermore, such use of the disputed domain names cannot be considered a legitimate non-commercial or fair use without intent for commercial gain, because the Respondent is undoubtedly attempting to gain profit from the sales of prima facie counterfeit products and it is clear that the Respondent's intention is to benefit from the Complainant's trademarks' reputation to disrupt the Complainant's business and to illegitimately trade on the Complainant's fame for commercial gain.

In the light of the aforementioned reasons, the Complainant concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

D. THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAMES WERE REGISTERED AND ARE BEING USED IN BAD FAITH

As to the assessment of the Respondent's bad faith at the time of registration, in light of the registration and intensive use of the trademark "STONE ISLAND" since 1982, the advertising and sales of the Complainant's products worldwide, the Respondent could not have possibly ignored the existence of the Complainant's trademark, confusingly similar to the disputed domain names.

The aforesaid trademark of the Complainant enjoys worldwide reputation in the sector of manufacturing luxury apparels. The disputed domain names were registered in 2023, years after the Complainant obtained its trademark registrations.

Furthermore, the actual knowledge of "STONE ISLAND" trademark by Respondent at the time of the registration of the disputed domain names is demonstrated by the facts that in most of disputed domain names the Respondent offers for sale replicas of Complainant's goods and that the Respondent also reproduces the trademarks "STONE ISLAND" on the web sites corresponding to the disputed domain names.

By virtue of its extensive worldwide use, the Complainant's trademark "STONE ISLAND" has become a well-known trademark in the sector of manufacturing luxury outdoor wear. The Complainant's "STONE ISLAND" is a famous trademark and considering the trademark's distinctiveness and well-known character, it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the existence of the Complainant's registered trademark at the time of the registration of the disputed domain names, with which it is confusingly similar.

Therefore, it is clear that the Respondent was well aware of the trademark "STONE ISLAND" and has registered the disputed domain names with the intention to refer to the Complainant and to its trademarks.

Indeed, the fact that replicas of "STONE ISLAND" products are being offered for sale on the active web sites corresponding to the disputed domain names indicates that the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant's mark's reputation and association with the Complainant and that his purpose in registering the disputed domain names, which incorporates the Complainant's trademark "STONE ISLAND", was solely intended to capitalize on the reputation of Complainant's mark by diverting Internet users seeking products under the "STONE ISLAND" trademark to its own commercial web site.

The use of the disputed domain names in connection with commercial web sites where the Complainant's trademark is misappropriated and prima facie counterfeit "STONE ISLAND" branded products are offered for sale, clearly indicates that the Respondent's purpose in registering the disputed domain names was to capitalize on the reputation of the Complainant's trademark by diverting Internet users seeking "STONE ISLAND" products to their websites for financial gain, by intentionally creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its web sites and/or the goods offered or promoted through said web sites, according to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

In registering twenty-nine disputed domain names, confusingly similar to the trademark "STONE ISLAND", the Respondent has been engaged in a pattern of conduct preventing the Complainant from reflecting the mark in corresponding disputed domain names.

In light of the above, the Complainant respectfully submits that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith in full satisfaction of paragraphs 4(a)(iii) and 4(b) of the Policy.

RESPONDENT

No administratively compliant Response was filed.

RIGHTS

To the satisfaction of the Panel, the Complainant has shown that some of the disputed domain names, as described below, are identical or confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

To the satisfaction of the Panel, the Complainant has shown the Respondent to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of some of the disputed domain names, as described below (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

BAD FAITH

To the satisfaction of the Panel, the Complainant has shown that some of the disputed domain names, as described below, have been registered and are being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

Before moving on to the dispute's substance, the Panel must weigh in on a couple procedural matters.

The first matter relates to a communication by the Complainant dated May 12, where the Complainant noted that the email provided in the Amended Complaint dated April 28 did not include the correct email for the Registrant of the disputed domain name <stoneislandaustralia.org>. All other information was however, clearly identified in the Amended Complaint.

In abundance of caution, the Service Provider extended the deadline for a Response on May 12, 2023 until May 31, 2023. Nevertheless, the Respondent did not provide a Response.

The second procedural matter that needs to be addressed is the request for the consolidation of multiple Respondents. For this, the Panel finds guidance under paragraph 4.11.2 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, namely, "Where a complaint is filed against multiple respondents, panels look at whether (i) the domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control, and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties."

In this matter, the Complainant provided various arguments under element A above for PRELIMINARY PROCEDURAL MATTERS.

Based on the record, the Panel notes that all the disputed domain names have many similarities which can be summarized below.

It should be preliminarily noted that the disputed domain names share the following similarities:

- same registrar: Gransy s.r.o.
- same lay-out of the active websites: same favicons, same headers, same footers, same products offered for sale;
- same date of registration of the disputed domain names;
- presence of geographical terms associated to the Complainant's trademark in the domain

In addition, it appears, based on the evidence on record, that the information provided as contact details is false, and the contact details seems to repeat a pattern in the name of the Registrant, namely a name followed by a string of characters which often includes numbers.

Finally, on the balance of probability and based on the evidence on record in conjunction, the Panel is left to conclude that the disputed domain names are indeed subject to common control. Accordingly, based on this, the Panel determines that the consolidation of Respondents would be fair and equitable to all parties. Hence, from this point on, the term Respondent shall be understood to refer to all the Respondents in this matter.

The Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under UDRP have been met, and there is no other reason why it would be unsuitable for providing the Decision.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Regarding the first step under this element, and as per evidence on record, the Complainant has owned several trademarks containing the term "STONE ISLAND" since at least 1987. Therefore, based on this, the Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has shown its trademark rights in "STONE ISLAND".

Turning now to the second step under this element, namely, assessing the confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the trademarks, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names reproduce the trademark "STONE ISLAND" in its entirety, without spaces plus another term, which in most instances happens to be a geographical location, most often than not a city or country. In two instances, the disputed domain names follow the same pattern mentioned but add an anteceding string of two characters followed by two hyphens and ending in a hyphen and two characters. Nevertheless, the disputed domain names seem to follow a similar identifiable pattern. Having mentioned these across-the-board similarities, the Panel would classify these under slight changes, which are not substantial enough to dispel a finding of confusing similarity.

Although the content of the website is generally disregarded for an assessment under the first element, in this instance, as per paragraph 1.15 of the WIPO Overview, which in this instance is persuasive to the Panel, the Panel takes note of the content of the website associated with the disputed domain names to confirm confusing similarity whereby it appears prima facie that the Respondent seeks to target a trademark through the disputed domain names; nevertheless, further analysis of said content will bear more detailed assessment under the second and third elements below, namely whether there may be legitimate co-existence or fair use, or an intent to create user confusion.

Based on this, the Panel finds the disputed domain names to be confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. As a result, the Panel determines that the Complaint has satisfied the Policy's first element set under paragraph 4(a)(i).

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Based on the evidence on record and acknowledging that the Respondent failed to produce any allegations or evidence necessary, the Panel must turn to the uncontested facts.

The uncontested facts indicate that the Respondent is not licensed or authorized to carry out any activity for the Complainant; the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant; the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names; the Respondent has not provided evidence of the use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, of the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services before any notice of the dispute; the Respondent did not reply to the cease and desist letter, and the Respondent redirects the disputed domain names to websites where the Complainant's trademarks, "STONE ISLAND", are published, and what appears to be counterfeit products appear to be offered for sale.

In the Panel's view, these assertions and the evidence attached are enough to establish a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names (see 2.1 of WIPO 3.0 Overview).

These facts lead the Panel to conclude that the Respondent did not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

Consequently, the Panel determines that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. Subsequently, the Complainant has fulfilled the second requirement set under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that as per the evidence on record, the Respondent was likely aware of the Complainant and had the Complainant's trademarks in mind when registering the disputed domain names. As per the record, this is evidenced by the content of the websites associated with the disputed domain names, which replicate the Complainant's trademark and prominently products that appear to be from the Complainant, although the Complainant asserts these are most likely counterfeit.

Although the Panel cannot determine if the products appearing on the websites of the disputed domain names are counterfeit, under paragraph 2.13 of the WIPO 3.0 Overview, which is persuasive to the Panel, the Respondent seems to have masked its identity to avoid being contactable. Although this is usually considered under the second element above, this provides the Panel with a holistic view of what, based on the record at hand, is more likely to be bad faith from the Respondent.

Additionally, as per the evidence on record and balance of probability, the Panel is left with no other option than to conclude that the most likely intention of the Respondent was to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website/disputed domain name, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website and/or disputed domain name, as per illustrated under paragraph 3.1 of WIPO 3.0 Overview.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied the final element required under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

In light of the case's circumstances, based on the available records, the Panel finds that the Complainant has proven that the disputed domain names were registered and are used in bad faith according to paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

D. Decision

For the preceding reasons and in concurrence with the provisions specified under Paragraph 4(i) of the Policy and Paragraph 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders the transfer of the disputed domain names to the Complainant.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **stoneislandaustralia.org**: Transferred
2. **xn--stoneislandbelgi-prb.com**: Transferred
3. **stoneislandbelgique.org**: Transferred
4. **stoneislandbrasil.com**: Transferred
5. **stoneislandbulgaria.com**: Transferred
6. **stoneislandcanada.org**: Transferred
7. **stoneislanddenmark.org**: Transferred
8. **stoneislandeesti.com**: Transferred
9. **stoneislandgreece.com**: Transferred
10. **stoneislandhrvatska.com**: Transferred
11. **stoneislandireland.org**: Transferred
12. **stoneislandisrael.com**: Transferred
13. **stoneislandjapan.com**: Transferred
14. **stoneislandlatvia.com**: Transferred
15. **stoneislandlietuva.com**: Transferred
16. **xn--stoneislandmxico-mqb.com**: Transferred
17. **stoneislandmagyarorszag.com**: Transferred
18. **stoneislandnederland.com**: Transferred
19. **stoneislandnorge.org**: Transferred
20. **stoneislandportugal.com**: Transferred
21. **stoneislandromania.com**: Transferred
22. **stoneislandschweiz.com**: Transferred
23. **stoneislandslovenija.com**: Transferred
24. **stoneislandsouthafrica.org**: Transferred
25. **stoneislandspain.com**: Transferred
26. **stoneislandsrbija.com**: Transferred
27. **stoneislandsuomi.org**: Transferred
28. **stoneislandturkiye.com**: Transferred
29. **stoneislanduae.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Rodolfo Rivas Rea
------	--------------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION	2023-06-15
------------------------	------------

Publish the Decision
