Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-106371

Case number	CAC-UDRP-106371
Time of filing	2024-03-26 09:35:06
Domain names	INTESASOPAOLOS.COM

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Intesa Sanpaolo S.p.A.

Complainant representative

Organization	Intesa Sanpaolo S.p.A.

Respondent

Organization	Termo Electrica

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 has rights in the following trademarks:

- International trademark registration n. 920896 “INTESA SANPAOLO”, registered on March 7, 2007 in connection with classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 38, 41 and 42;

- International trademark registration n. 793367 “INTESA”, registered on September 4, 2002 in connection with class 36;

- EU trademark registration n. 5301999 “INTESA SANPAOLO”, registered on June 18, 2007 in connection with the classes 35, 36 and 38;

- EU trademark registration n. 12247979 “INTESA”, registered on March 5, 2014 in connection with classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 38, 41 and 42.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is the leading Italian banking group and also one of the protagonists in the European financial area. 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 of the top Italian banking groups.

The disputed domain name <intesasopaolos.com> was registered on February 23, 2023. It resolves to a website with pay-per-click links displaying the Complainant's INTESA SAN PAOLO mark.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it.

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

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable."

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that a domain name should be cancelled or transferred:

- the domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
- the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith
  In view of the Respondent's failure to submit a response, the Panel shall decide this administrative proceeding on the basis of the Complainant's undisputed representations pursuant to paragraphs 5(f), 14(a) and 15(a) of the Rules and draw such inferences as it considers appropriate pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules. The Panel is entitled to accept all reasonable allegations set forth in a complaint; however, the Panel may deny relief where a complaint contains mere conclusory or unsubstantiated arguments. See WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0 at paragraph 4.3.

  As to the first element, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name <intesasopaolos.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s very well-known INTESA and INTESA SANPAOLO trademarks, since it includes the INTESA mark in its entirety and, in a clear example of typosquatting, merely misspells the word SANPAOLO as SOPAOLOS, which is insufficient to distinguish the disputed domain name from the marks. The inconsequential gTLD “.com” may be ignored.
  As to the second element, paragraph 4(c) of the Policy sets out three illustrative circumstances as examples which, if established by the Respondent, shall demonstrate rights to or legitimate interests in the domain name for purposes of

paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, i.e.

(i) before any notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the use by the Respondent of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

(ii) the Respondent (as an individual, business or other organization) has been commonly known by the domain name, even if the Respondent has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert customers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name; has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and is not related in any way with the Complainant; the Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent; and neither license nor authorization has been granted by the Complainant to the Respondent to make any use of the Complainant's INTESA and INTESA SANPAOLO trademarks nor to apply for registration of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name <intesasopaolos.com> was registered on February 23, 2023, many years after the Complainant has shown that its INTESA and INTESA SANPAOLO trademarks had become very well-known. It resolves to a webpage displaying five pay-per-click links, each of which includes the Complainant's INTESA SANPAOLO mark, namely "intesa san paolo stock price', "intesa sanpaolo number of employees", "intesa sanpaolo s.p.a", "intesa sanpaolo share price" and "intesa sanpaolo private banking".

These circumstances, together with the Complainant's assertions, are sufficient to constitute a prima facie showing of absence of rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name on the part of the Respondent. The evidentiary burden therefore shifts to the Respondent to show that it does have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. See JUUL Labs, Inc. v. Dryx Emerson / KMF Events LTD, FA1906001849706 (Forum July 17, 2019). The Respondent has made no attempt to do so.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

As to the third element, given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademarks and reputation, the Panel infers that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks and is using it in bad faith intentionally to attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's web site, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its web site. This is evidence of bad faith registration and use under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **INTESASOPAOLOS.COM**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Alan Limbury**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2024-04-19

Publish the Decision