

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107418

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107418
-------------	------------------------

Time of filing	2025-03-21 09:03:47
----------------	----------------------------

Domain names	FILIALEDIGITALEINTESASANPAOLO.COM
--------------	------------------------------------------

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	Maria Miceli
------	---------------------

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 the owner, among others, of the following registrations for the trademarks "INTESA SANPAOLO" and "INTESA":

- International trademark registration n. 920896 "INTESA SANPAOLO", granted on March 7, 2007 and duly renewed, in connection with classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 38, 41 and 42;

- 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", filed on September 8, 2006, granted on June 18, 2007 and duly renewed, in connection with the 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.

Moreover, 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, CLIENTI-INTESASANPAOLO.COM, SERVIZICLIENTI-INTESASANPAOLO.COM, INTESASANPAOLO-CLIENTI.COM, CLIENTE-INTESASANPAOLO.ONLINE, CLIENTE-INTESASANPAOLO.COM, ASSISTENZA-INTESASANPAOLO.COM 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 <http://www.intesasampaolo.com>.

On November 26, 2024, the Respondent registered the domain name <FILIALEDIGITALEINTESASANPAOLO.COM>.

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.

Intesa Sanpaolo is among the top banking groups in the euro zone, with a market capitalisation exceeding 46,51 billion euro, and the undisputed leader in Italy, in all business areas (retail, corporate and wealth management). Thanks to a network of approximately 3,400 branches capillary and well distributed throughout the Country, with market shares of more than 16% in most Italian regions, the Group offers its services to approximately 13,6 million customers. Intesa Sanpaolo has a strong presence in Central-Eastern Europe with a network of approximately 950 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.

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.

The disputed domain name is identical, or – at least – confusingly similar, to the Complainant's trademarks "INTESA SANPAOLO" and "INTESA". As a matter of fact, <FILIALEDIGITALEINTESASANPAOLO.COM> exactly reproduces the well-known trademark "INTESA SANPAOLO", with the mere addition of the Italian expression "FILIALE DIGITALE" (meaning "DIGITAL SUBSIDIARY"), which refers to a service offered by Intesa Sanpaolo to its customers. It follows that the disputed domain name is confusing and misleading for Internet users, who might think that the disputed domain name is somehow connected to the business of the Complainant.

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 Complainant to use the domain name at issue.

The domain name <FILIALEDIGITALEINTESASANPAOLO.COM> 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, the disputed domain name is not used for any bona fide offerings. More particularly, there are circumstances indicating that the Respondent has registered or acquired the domain name primarily for either 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 the Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name, or for phishing purposes.

The Complainant believes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name for 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) and by the nature of Complainant's business which makes the Complainant even more prone to phishing attacks.

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).

It is well established that the specific top level of a domain name such as ".com" does not affect the domain name for the purpose of determining whether it is identical or confusingly similar. Neither does the mere addition of generic terms like in this case "filiale digitale", therefor the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark INTESA SANPAOLO.

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).

Given the circumstances of the case, including the provided information of the use and reputation of the Complainant's trademark INTESA SANPAOLO and the distinctive nature of this mark, it is inconceivable to the Panel in the current circumstances that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without prior knowledge of the Complainant and the Complainant's mark.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

Though no concrete examples of such use have been presented to this Panel, it seems likely that the MX records associated with the disputed domain name may be actively used for e-mail and phishing purposes. It is inconceivable without evidence to support the opposite that the Respondent will be able to make any good faith use of the disputed domain name as part of an e-mail address.

Furthermore, the Panel finds that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a well-known or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity is sufficient to create a presumption of bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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

1. The three essential issues under the paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are whether:

- i. the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark 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 and is being used in bad faith.

2. The Panel reviewed carefully all documents provided by the Complainant. The Respondent did not provide the Panel with any documents or statements. The Panel also visited all available websites and public information concerning the disputed domain name, namely the WHOIS databases.

3. The UDRP Rules clearly say in its Article 3 that any person or entity may initiate an administrative proceeding by submitting a complaint in accordance with the Policy and these Rules.

4. The Panel therefore came to the following conclusions:

a) The Complainant states and proves that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademarks and its domain names. Indeed, the trademark is fully incorporated in the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name is therefore deemed confusingly similar.

b) The Respondent is not generally known by the disputed domain name and have not acquired any trademark or service mark rights in the name or mark, nor is there any authorization for the Respondent by the Complainant to use or register the disputed domain name.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interest with respect to the disputed domain name.

c) It is clear that the Complainant's trademarks and website(s) were used by the Complainant long time before the disputed domain name was registered.

It is concluded that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a well-known or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity is sufficient to create a presumption of bad faith.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

For the reasons stated above, it is the decision of this Panel that the Complainant has satisfied all three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

- 1. **FILIALEDIGITALEINTESASANPAOLO.COM**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Lars Karnoe
------	-------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-04-28

Publish the Decision