# Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108309

| | |
|---|---|
| Case number | CAC-UDRP-108309 |
| Time of filing | 2026-02-02 11:16:48 |
| Domain names | loropiana-sale.shop, loropiana-worlds.shop |

## Case administrator

| | |
|---|---|
| Name | Olga Slanařová (Case admin) |

## Complainant

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization | Loro Piana S.p.A. |

## Complainant representative

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization | Barzanò & Zanardo Milano S.p.A. |

## Respondents

| | |
|---|---|
| Name | Lin Zhibing |
| Name | Chen Yupei |

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is unaware of any other pending or decided legal proceedings in respect of the domain names <loropiana-sale.shop> and <loropiana-worlds.shop> (collectively, the "Disputed Domain Names").

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant, Loro Piana S.p.A., is the holder of the following registered trade marks, among others:

- International registration no. 578976, registered on 13 November 1991, for the mark LORO PIANA, in classes 23, 24 and 25 of the Nice Classification, designating China and Mongolia; and
- EU trade mark registration no. 007383136, registered on 9 June 2009, for the mark LORO PIANA, in classes 9, 14 and 35 of the Nice Classification.

(Each a "trade mark" and collectively, the "Complainant's trade marks").

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A. Complainant's Assertions

The Complainant is an Italian luxury fashion brand, founded in 1924 and headquartered in Milan. It is a globally recognised manufacturer and retailer of luxury textiles and ready-to-wear clothing, and has been majority-owned by Moët Hennessy Louis Vuitton (LVMH) since 2013.

The Complainant submits that the LORO PIANA trade mark is distinctive and enjoys substantial international reputation as a result of longstanding and continuous use spanning several decades.

B. Respondent's Position

No Response has been filed in the record before the Panel.

C. Disputed Domain Names

The Disputed Domain Names were registered between 9 October 2025 and 12 November 2025.

At the time of writing of this Decision, <loropiana-sale.shop> resolves to a website offering purported LORO PIANA products and prominently featuring the Complainant's trade marks, whereas <loropiana-worlds.shop> is currently inactive (collectively, the "Respondent's websites").

---

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

A. Complainant

A.1 Consolidation

The Complainant requests consolidation of the Disputed Domain Names in a single proceeding under Rule 3(c) and Rule 10(e) of the UDRP Rules, on the basis that the domain names are under common control and that consolidation would promote procedural efficiency and fairness. The Complainant submits that the Disputed Domain Names share common features, including registration within a short timeframe, the same registrar, the same name servers, a consistent naming pattern incorporating the LORO PIANA trade mark with generic terms, and similar registrant contact details.

A.2 Language of the Proceeding

The Complainant requests that the language of the proceeding be English. The Complainant acknowledges that, according to the Registrar's verification, the language of the Registration Agreements for the Disputed Domain Names is Chinese, and that the CAC Centre invited the Complainant either to translate the Complaint and annexes into Chinese or to submit a request for English to be adopted as the language of the proceeding. The Complainant has chosen to make such a request.

The Complainant submits that neither it nor its representative understands Chinese, and that requiring translation of the Complaint and annexes would be burdensome, costly, and would delay the proceeding, contrary to the objective of efficient resolution under the UDRP Policy. The Complainant further notes that the Respondent's website content was in English, and that the Disputed Domain Names comprise Latin characters and English terms (including "sale" and "worlds"). The Complainant submits that English is appropriate and equitable under the circumstances.

A.3 Substantive grounds

A.3.1 The Disputed Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark in which the Complainant has rights

Each Disputed Domain Name reproduces the LORO PIANA trade mark in its entirety with only non-distinctive additions: <loropiana-sale.shop> includes "sale" and <loropiana-worlds.shop> includes "worlds", both separated by a hyphen. The Complainant submits that these additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity given the recognisability of the LORO PIANA trade mark and that the generic Top-Level Domain (the "TLD") <.shop> is to be disregarded in the similarity assessment.

A.3.2 The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Names

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no relationship with, nor authorisation from, the Complainant to use its trade marks, and no evidence exists that the Respondent holds any rights in trade names or marks corresponding to the Disputed Domain Names. The Complainant submits that <loropiana-sale.shop> resolved to a website selling products under the Complainant's trade marks, which does not constitute bona fide use. Further, the Disputed Domain Name <loropiana-worlds.shop> is inactive and, given the distinctiveness of the mark, cannot plausibly be used legitimately.

A.3.3 The Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Names in bad faith

The Complainant asserts that the distinctive and well-known nature of the LORO PIANA trade mark makes it implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration.

The Complainant further submits that the Disputed Domain Name <loropiana-sale.shop> was used to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks for commercial gain.

As regards the Disputed Domain Name <loropiana-worlds.shop>, the Complainant relies on the doctrine of passive holding and

submits that, in light of the reputation of the Complainant's mark and the absence of any plausible legitimate use, the passive holding of the domain name supports a finding of bad faith.

A.3.4 Relief Sought

The Complainant requests that the Disputed Domain Names <loropiana-sale.shop> and <loropiana-worlds.shop> be transferred to the Complainant in accordance with paragraph 4(i) of the UDRP Policy.

B. Respondent

No Response was filed. The Panel proceeds on the unchallenged evidence before it.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown that the Disputed Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the UDRP Policy).

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Names (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Disputed Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the UDRP Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

1. Consolidation

Under Rules 3 (c) and 10(e) of the UDRP Rules, the Panel may consolidate multiple domain names into a single proceeding where they are under common control and where consolidation promotes procedural efficiency and fairness.

The Disputed Domain Names were registered within a short timeframe, with the same registrar and name servers, and follow a consistent naming pattern incorporating the Complainant's distinctive mark with descriptive additions. In the absence of any Response and taking into account the overall factual pattern, the Panel finds that the circumstances support an inference of common control. Consolidation promotes procedural efficiency and does not prejudice the Respondent. The request for consolidation is therefore granted.

2. Language of the Proceeding

Rule 11 of the UDRP Rules provides that the default language of the proceeding is the language of the Registration Agreement, subject to the Panel's discretion to determine otherwise having regard to the circumstances of the case.

The Panel notes that the Registrar's verification confirms that the language of the Registration Agreements for the Disputed Domain Names is Chinese. The CAC Centre accordingly invited the Complainant either to translate the Complaint and annexes into Chinese or to request that English be adopted as the language of the proceeding. The Complainant elected the latter. No Response has been filed and no objection to the Complainant's request has been received.

Having regard to (i) the Complainant's inability to communicate in Chinese and the disproportionate burden and delay that translation would entail; (ii) the composition of the Disputed Domain Names in Latin characters and English terms; (iii) the English-language content displayed on the website at the Disputed Domain Name <loropiana-sale.shop>; and (iv) the absence of any objection or participation by the Respondent, the Panel determines that English shall be the language of the proceeding. The Panel is satisfied that this determination does not unfairly prejudice the Respondent and is consistent with fairness and procedural efficiency.

3. Procedural compliance

The Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under the UDRP Policy, the UDRP Rules, and the CAC Supplemental Rules have been met. The dispute is properly filed before the Panel.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

A. Applicable Legal Framework

Pursuant to Rule 15 of the UDRP Rules, the Panel decides on the basis of the statements and evidence submitted, in accordance with the UDRP Policy, the UDRP Rules, and any applicable principles of law.

Under paragraph 4(a) of the UDRP Policy, the Complainant must establish, on the balance of probabilities, that:

i. The Disputed Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

ii. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Names; and

iii. The Disputed Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

B. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has demonstrated rights in the LORO PIANA trade marks.

Each Disputed Domain Name incorporates the LORO PIANA trade mark in its entirety. The addition of the descriptive terms "sale" and "worlds" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, as the Complainant's mark remains clearly recognisable within the Disputed Domain Names. The TLD <.shop> is disregarded for the purposes of comparison.

Accordingly, paragraph 4(a)(i) of the UDRP Policy is satisfied.

C. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Respondent has not filed any Response and has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie case.

The use of the Disputed Domain Name <loropiana-sale.shop> for a website prominently displaying the Complainant's trade marks and offering purported LORO PIANA products cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services. Such use carries a clear risk of implied affiliation and is inherently misleading.

With respect to the Disputed Domain Name <loropiana-worlds.shop>, the Panel considers that, given the distinctiveness of the LORO PIANA trade mark and the absence of any explanation from the Respondent, there is no plausible legitimate use to which the domain name could be put.

On the balance of probabilities, paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP Policy is satisfied.

D. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that the LORO PIANA trade mark is distinctive and well known, and that the Disputed Domain Names were registered decades after the Complainant acquired its rights. It is implausible that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Names without knowledge of the Complainant's trade marks.

The Disputed Domain Name <loropiana-sale.shop> resolves to a website offering purported LORO PIANA products, prominently featuring the Complainant's trade marks. This use supports a finding that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the UDRP Policy.

The registration of two domain names incorporating the Complainant's distinctive trade marks within a short period further reinforces the inference of deliberate targeting of the Complainant.

With respect to <loropiana-worlds.shop>, the domain name is inactive. However, the passive holding of a domain name incorporating a distinctive and well-known trade mark may, in appropriate circumstances, constitute bad faith. In the present case, the Panel takes into account the reputation of the Complainant's trade marks, the absence of any Response, and the lack of any conceivable good-faith use of the Disputed Domain Name. These circumstances support a finding of bad faith in respect of <loropiana-worlds.shop> as well.

Taken together, the evidence demonstrates that the Respondent's conduct falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the UDRP Policy and that the Disputed Domain Names were both registered and used in bad faith.

Accordingly, paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the UDRP Policy is satisfied.

E. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraph 4(i) of the UDRP Policy and Rule 15 of the UDRP Rules, the Panel orders that the Disputed Domain Names <loropiana-sale.shop> and <loropiana-worlds.shop> be transferred to the Complainant, Loro Piana S.p.A.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **loropiana-sale.shop**: Transferred
2. **loropiana-worlds.shop**: Transferred

## PANELLISTS

| Name | **Yana Zhou** |
|---|---|

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-02-27

Publish the Decision