Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108308

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108308
Time of filing	2026-01-23 14:07:26
Domain names	loropianassale.com

Case administrator

Organization	Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Loro Piana S.p.A.

Complainant representative

Organization	Barzanò & Zanardo S.p.A.

Respondent

Organization	LOROSPAS Inc

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 the others, of the following trademarks:

- International trademark registration number 578976 for the LORO PIANA registered on November 13, 1991;

- European trademark registration number 007383136, for LORO PIANA (device) registered on June 9, 2009;

- International Reg. No. 1546962 for LORO PIANA (device) registered on May 22, 2020; and

- United States trademark registration number 1337982 for the LORO PIANA registered on May 28, 1985.

The Complainant registered its official domain name <loropiana.com> on September 14, 2001. The disputed domain name was registered on October 21, 2025.

The disputed domain name was redirected to a webpage offering goods competing with those of the Complainant at a steep discount and bearing the LORO PIANA trademark.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, Loro Piana S.p.A., is an Italian luxury fashion house founded in 1924 and headquartered in Milan. It is internationally renowned for the manufacture of high-end textiles and ready-to-wear clothing, particularly cashmere and other luxury fibers. Since 2013, the company has been majority-owned by LVMH and has expanded to other goods including leather goods. The LORO PIANA trademark has been recognized in prior UDRP decisions as enjoying a significant reputation. The Complainant operates a substantial global retail network and maintains an active presence on social media platforms. The Complainant's sales in 2019 reach Euro 1 billion.

At the time of filing, the disputed domain name redirected to a website offering purported LORO PIANA-branded products at heavily discounted prices, together with third-party goods. The website displayed the Complainant’s trademark, images, and products without authorization.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

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

LANGUAGE OF THE PROCEEDINGS

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. The Complaint has been filed in English. The Complainant has requested that English be the language of the proceeding for the following reasons:

1. The disputed domain name is composed entirely of Latin characters and incorporates the Complainant’s LORO PIANA trademark together with the letter "s" and the English term “sale” and the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com”. The composition of the disputed domain name, including the use of English wording, indicates familiarity with the English language rather than Chinese.

2. Prior to the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website in English. The content of the website, including product listings and related material, was presented in English. At the time of the filing of the amended Complaint, the website appears to have been deactivated.

3. The Respondent’s contact details list the United States as the country of residence. English is the primary language used in the United States. This further supports the inference that the Respondent is likely conversant in English.

4. The Complainant is not familiar with Chinese and would be required to translate the Complaint and all annexes into Chinese. This would result in additional cost and delay. Given the summary and expedited nature of proceedings under the Policy, such a requirement would impose a disproportionate burden on the Complainant.

Taking all of the above circumstances into account, and in the exercise of its discretion under paragraph 11 of the Rules, the Panel determines that English shall be the language of the proceeding.

The Panel is satisfied that all other 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. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy requires the Complainant to demonstrate that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which it has rights.

The Complainant has established rights in the LORO PIANA trademark. The disputed domain name <loropianassale.com> incorporates the LORO PIANA mark in its entirety. As noted in Section 1.7 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or at least a recognizable dominant feature thereof, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark for purposes of the first element.

The only differences between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's mark are the addition of the letter "s" following the mark "loropiana" and the descriptive term "sale". The addition of a single letter constitutes a minor typographical variation and does not prevent the mark from being clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. Nor does the addition of the term "sale" dispel confusing similarity.

The generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is a standard registration requirement and is disregarded for the purpose of the confusing similarity assessment.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights. The first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

2. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy requires the Complainant to establish that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. Once a complainant makes a prima facie showing, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests. See Section 2.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.0

The Complainant states that it has not authorized the Respondent to use the LORO PIANA trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The record shows that the disputed domain name resolved to a commercial website prominently displaying the Complainant's trademarks and offering purported LORO PIANA products at heavily discounted prices, together with third-party competing goods. The website did not contain any disclaimer of affiliation. Such use, does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

In the absence of any Response, and on the evidence before it, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case which has not been rebutted. Accordingly, the second element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

3. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy requires the Complainant to demonstrate that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel finds that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its LORO PIANA trademark at the time of registration. The disputed domain name incorporates the mark in its entirety, together with the descriptive term "sale" and resolves to a website offering purported LORO PIANA products at heavily discounted prices, together with third-party goods. The LORO PIANA mark is distinctive and well known in the luxury fashion sector. In these circumstances, it is not plausible that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's rights. The content of the website, which prominently featured the Complainant's trademarks, logo, and wat appears to be the Complainant's product images, further confirms such awareness and specific targeting by the Respondent of the Complainant.

The evidence also indicates that the Respondent used inaccurate or misleading registrant information. The disclosed registrant name appears not to correspond to an existing company, and the address provided matches that of an official Loro Piana boutique in New York. The provision of false contact details supports an inference of bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The third element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **loropianassale.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Jonathan Agmon**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-03-04

Publish the Decision