Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108310

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108310
Time of filing	2026-02-02 11:36:25
Domain names	loropiana-discounts.shop, loropiana-online.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	CY CY

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 names.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant owns several trademarks consisting of or including the word element “LORO PIANA”.

Some of the most relevant trademarks are as follows:

• International trademark registration No. 578976 “LORO PIANA” (word), registered on November 13, 1991, in classes 23, 24 and 25;

• EU trademark registration No. 007383136 “LORO PIANA” (device), filed on November 11, 2008, registered on June 9, 2009, in classes 9, 14 and 35;

• International trademark registration No. 1546962 “LORO PIANA” (device), registered on May 22, 2020, in class 25, designating, inter alia, the United States.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <loropiana.com>, registered on September 14, 2001, which resolves to the Complainant’s official website.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, Loro Piana S.p.A., is an Italian luxury fashion brand headquartered in Milan and specialised in textile manufacturing and ready-to-wear clothing. Founded in 1924, the company is widely recognised as one of the world's largest manufacturers of cashmere and a leading artisan company processing luxury fibre.

Over the decades, the Complainant has expanded its activities from textile production to luxury goods, including knitwear, footwear, leather goods and accessories. The brand has a global presence with approximately 145 retail stores worldwide and distributes its products across Europe, North America, the Middle East and Asia.

The trademark LORO PIANA enjoys a significant reputation and has been recognised as a well-known trademark in previous UDRP decisions.

The disputed domain names:

- <loropiana-discounts.shop>
- <loropiana-online.com>

were registered by the Respondent on 24 September 2025.

At the time of the decision, the disputed domain names resolve to inactive websites.

No information is available about the Respondent.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

Complainant:

Identical or confusingly similar

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its LORO PIANA trademarks.

The disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, with the only additions being the descriptive terms "discounts" and "online", separated by a hyphen.

According to the Complainant, such additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity and may even increase the likelihood of confusion, as Internet users may believe the domain names refer to an official website offering discounted or online products of the Complainant.

No rights or legitimate interests

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

In particular:

- the Respondent has no relationship with the Complainant;
- the Respondent has never been authorised to use the LORO PIANA trademark;
- the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names;
- the Respondent has not demonstrated any bona fide use of the domain names.

The disputed domain names are currently inactive, and considering their incorporation of the well-known trademark LORO PIANA, it is difficult to conceive any legitimate use.

Registered and used in bad faith

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

The Complainant submits that:

- the trademark LORO PIANA is widely known worldwide;
- the Respondent could not reasonably have been unaware of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration;
- the term "Loro Piana" is distinctive and corresponds to the name of the founder of the company.

The Complainant further argues that the Respondent is passively holding the disputed domain names, which may constitute bad faith use according to established UDRP case law (notably Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows).

Respondent:

The Respondent did not submit any response to the Complaint.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to a trademark 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 names (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 names have been registered and are 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

According to paragraph 15 of the Rules, the Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law deemed applicable.

Considering that the Respondent did not submit a Response, the Panel decides the case on the basis of the Complainant's factual assertions and the evidence submitted.

1. Confusing similarity

The Panel finds that the disputed domain names <loropiana-discounts.shop> and <loropiana-online.com> are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark LORO PIANA, as they incorporate the trademark in its entirety. The addition of the descriptive terms "discounts" and "online" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Such terms are generic and may reinforce the impression that the domain names relate to official online sales channels of the Complainant.

Furthermore, the Top-Level Domains ".shop" and ".com" are generally disregarded for the purpose of assessing confusing similarity.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is satisfied.

2. Rights or legitimate interests

The Panel accepts the Complainant's uncontested evidence that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, has not been authorised to use the LORO PIANA trademark nor is commonly known by the disputed domain names.

The disputed domain names are currently inactive, and the Respondent has not provided any evidence of demonstrable preparations to use the domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

In the absence of any Response, the Panel concludes that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

Therefore, paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy is satisfied.

3. Bad faith

The Panel finds that the disputed domain names were registered in bad faith and conditions of passing holding are met in this case.

Given the strong reputation of the LORO PIANA trademark, it is highly unlikely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names without knowledge of the Complainant and its rights.

The disputed domain names reproduce the trademark in its entirety, combined only with descriptive terms. Such composition suggests an intention to create an association with the Complainant's brand.

Furthermore, the disputed domain names are currently passively held. According to established UDRP jurisprudence, passive holding of a domain name incorporating a well-known trademark may constitute bad faith use, particularly where no plausible legitimate use can be envisaged.

Taking into account:

- the distinctive and well-known character of the Complainant's trademark;
- the lack of any response from the Respondent and in general any activity from the respondent regarding use of the domain names or participation in this administrative proceeding;
- the absence of any evidence of legitimate use;

the Panel concludes that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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. **loropiana-discounts.shop**: Transferred
2. **loropiana-online.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Hana Císlerová**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-03-06

Publish the Decision