Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107983

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107983
Time of filing	2025-09-26 09:40:33
Domain names	loropianaa.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Loro Piana S.p.A.

Complainant representative

Organization	Barzanò & Zanardo S.p.A.

Respondent

Name	Khalid AlHashmi

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 various trademark registrations for the mark LORO PIANA with figurative elements. These include, among others:

- European Union Trademark (EUTM) No. 007383136 filed on November 11, 2008, and registered on June 9, 2009, in int. classes 9, 14, and 35;
- European Union Trademark (EUTM) No. 018162715, filed on December 10, 2019, and registered on May 22, 2020, in int. class 25; and
- International Registration No. 1546962, registered on May 22, 2020, in int. class 25, designating, inter alia, the United States and China.

These registrations are hereinafter collectively referred to as the “LORO PIANA trademarks“ or „Complainant´s trademarks “.

Upon online review of the relevant official trademark registers, the Panel is satisfied that the above-mentioned registrations are valid and in force.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, Loro Piana S.p.A., is an Italian luxury fashion company specializing in high-end textile manufacturing and apparel, headquartered in Milan, Italy. It is recognized as one of the world's leading producers of cashmere products.

The Complainant is the owner, inter alia, of the domain name <loropiana.com>, which it uses in connection with its official online presence.

The disputed domain name <loropianaa.com> was registered on July 7, 2025.

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

Rights

The Complainant has demonstrated that it is the legitimate owner of the European Union and International LORO PIANA trademarks, which cover, inter alia, the territories of the European Union and the United States. The LORO PIANA trademarks comprise the verbal element "LORO PIANA" and a figurative element representing a coat of arms.

In assessing identity or confusing similarity, the Panel compares the alphanumeric domain name with the textual components of the relevant mark. Since figurative elements cannot be represented in domain names, they are disregarded for the purpose of this assessment (see WIPO O Jurisprudential Overview 3.0, section 1.10).

The Panel finds that the Complainant's trademark is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. The addition of an extra letter "A" at the end of the domain name constitutes an obvious and deliberate misspelling, which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Furthermore, the inclusion of the generic Top-Level Domain (".com") is a technical requirement of registration and is disregarded when assessing whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark (see Rollerblade, Inc. v. Chris McCrady, WIPO Case No. D2000-0429).

No Rights or Legitimate Interests

A complainant is required to establish a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. Once such a case is made, the burden of proof shifts to the respondent to demonstrate their rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Failure to do so results in the complainant satisfying paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy (as per Article 2.1 of WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0).

Based on the contentions of the Complainant, the panel finds that the Complainant has successfully established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. As the Respondent has failed to provide relevant evidence demonstrating any such rights or legitimate interests, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element.

Bad Faith

Registration in bad faith

The Panel notes that the Complainant has used the LORO PIANA trademarks continuously long before the registration of the disputed domain name in July 2025. The mark also forms part of the Complainant's company name and is distinctive, being derived from the founder's name.

Given that it is implausible that the Respondent was unaware of it when registering the disputed domain name. Further evidence shows that the domain was used for a website offering alleged LORO PIANA products, reinforcing that the registration was not coincidental.

The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's mark in its entirety, adding only an extra "A". The Panel finds this to be a deliberate misspelling constituting typosquatting. Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith with the intent to exploit the Complainant's trademark.

Use in Bad Faith

The Complainant provided evidence that the disputed domain name resolved to an active website displaying the LORO PIANA trademarks, including the coat of arms logo, and even mentioning Loro Piana S.p.A.. The site closely imitated the Complainant's official website (loropiana.com) and clearly sought to mislead consumers.

Even if the products offered on the website were genuine (which the Complainant disputes), the website would still fail the OKI Data test (WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.8), as it does not disclose the Respondent's lack of relationship with the Complainant and instead creates a false impression of being the Complainant's official website. The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent used the disputed domain name in bad faith, seeking to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a misleading association with the Complainant.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **loropianaa.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Karel Šindelka**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-11-10

Publish the Decision