Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108312

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108312
Time of filing	2026-02-18 09:30:00
Domain names	loropiana-jp.com, loropiana-pt.com, loropiana-tr.com, loro-pianauk.com, loropiana-us.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	zhang yong qiang

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other proceedings, pending or decided, which relate to each of the disputed domain names.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant owns the “Loro Piana” trademark registered in numerous jurisdictions all over the world, which were registered years before creation of the disputed domain name, such as but not limited to:

Mark name	Registration number	Filed date	Registration date	Class(es)
Loro Piana (device)	EU Reg. no. 018162715	2019-12-10	2020-05-22	25
Loro Piana (device)	EU Reg. no. 007383136	2008-11-11	2009-06-09	9, 14, 35
Loro Piana (device)	International Reg. no. 1546962	2020-05-22	2020-05-22	25 (designating United States, inter alia)
Loro Piana (device)	China Reg. no. 1048392	2020-05-04	2020-07-14	9

The Complainant is active on several social networks, such as Facebook with almost 100.000 followers, and Instagram with 1 million followers. The Complainant is also active on its website and e-commerce at www.loropiana.com.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is an Italian company specialising in clothing and textile products.

According to the Complainant, it is considered one of the largest cashmere manufacturers and the world's leading artisan company processing luxury fibers.

It has a total of 152 stores, of which 135 are directly operated. It has secured locations for units in Doha, Qatar, and Palo Alto, California, to open in the next 12 months.

It has reached the 1-billion-euro sales mark in 2019, and revenues in 2021 are forecast to surpass the 2019 figures.

It is also very active in the promotion of its “Loro Piana” trademark, and due to its longstanding use, promotional and advertising investments, its “Loro Piana” trademark is well-known.

Each of the disputed domain names is registered as follows:

Disputed domain name	Registrar name	Registrant name	Country	Registered on
loropiana-jp.com	Xin Net Technology Corporation	Zhong Cai	China	2025-10-21
loropiana-pt.com	Xin Net Technology Corporation	Zhong Cai	China	2025-10-21
loropiana-tr.com	Xin Net Technology Corporation	Zhong Cai	China	2025-10-21
loro-pianauk.com	Xin Net Technology Corporation	Zhong Cai	China	2025-10-21
loropiana-us.com	Xin Net Technology Corporation	Zhong Cai	China	2025-10-21

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that each of the disputed domain names should be transferred to it.

The Respondent failed to file any administratively compliant response.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown that each of the disputed domain names is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

The Complainant has established rights in the “Loro Piana” trademark through registrations in multiple jurisdictions as already set out. The Panel proceeds on the basis of these registered rights in the “Loro Piana” trademark.

The first element of the Policy involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant’s trademark and each of the disputed domain names, carried out on a side-by-side basis, to assess whether the mark is recognisable in each of the disputed domain names. Where the complainant’s mark is recognisable within the disputed domain name, the threshold test for identity or confusing similarity is satisfied.

The Complainants contend as follows:

- The disputed domain names are all confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks as they all contain the well-known “Loro Piana” trademark combined with geographic or generic words.
- All these terms, rather than excluding a similarity with the earlier well-known “Loro Piana” trademark, increase the likelihood of

confusion, since they refer to a specific country or city, thus underlying the fact that the website is directed to consumers located in a specific geographical area.
- The addition of the domain name extensions has no impact in the confusing similarity assessment since they have a technical function.

The "Loro Piana" trademark is clearly recognisable and is the dominant element of the disputed domain name. With the exception of the disputed domain name <loro-pianauk.com>, each of the disputed domain names has addition of a geographical abbreviation after the hyphen "-", for example, "jp" for Japan, "pt" for Portugal, "tr" for Türkiye, "us" for the United States.

These additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The disputed domain name <loro-pianauk.com> also captures the trademark, albeit interposed by the hyphen "-" between "loro" and "piana" with the "uk" geographical abbreviation for the United Kingdom. The Panel finds that this is confusingly similar when compared side by side to the "Loro Piana" trademark.

Where the relevant trademark is recognisable in the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms, whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless or otherwise, does not avoid a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. See WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.8.

The addition of the gTLD ".com" to the disputed domain name also does not add any distinctiveness to the disputed domain name and will be disregarded for the purposes of considering this ground. See WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the Panel considers that the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is made out.

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 each of the disputed domain names, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

A complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, after which the burden shifts to the respondent to demonstrate such rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the respondent fails to discharge this burden, paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy is satisfied.

Here, each of the disputed domain names was registered years after the Complainant had secured its "Loro Piana" trademark registrations. There is no evidence that the Respondent holds any trademark rights in, or is commonly known by, each of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name for several reasons, which the Panel accepts.

First, the Complainant asserts that it has not authorised the Respondent, whether as dealer, agent, distributor, reseller, or domain name licensee, to register and use the "Loro Piana" trademark in any of the disputed domain names.

According to the Complainant, some of the disputed domain names resolve to active websites that copy the Complainant's marketing images, mimic the "look and feel" of its official website, display its figurative trademark, and are being used to mislead consumers into buying counterfeit goods of "Loro Piana". The remaining disputed domain names redirect to inactive websites.

Given that each of the disputed domain names incorporates the "Loro Piana" trademark, the Complainant contends there is no plausible fair or legitimate use of them.

A respondent's use of a domain name will not be considered "fair" if it falsely suggests affiliation with the trademark owner, and panels have found that domain names that carry a risk of implied affiliation cannot confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. See WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.5.

The Respondent has also chosen to use a privacy service to mask its identity in the publicly available WHOIS data.

The Respondent has been given an opportunity in this proceeding to present a case for rights or legitimate interests but has failed to do so and has, therefore, not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie case.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of each of the disputed domain names, and that the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy is made out.

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown that each of the disputed domain names has been registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a non-exhaustive list of circumstances which, if present, constitute evidence of registration and use of a domain name in bad faith, including where a respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain,

Internet users to its online location by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

The evidence shows that the Complainant's "Loro Piana" trademark is well known, with registrations predating the disputed domain name and protection in numerous jurisdictions including China, where the Respondent appears to be based.

The Complainant also maintains a strong online presence through its official websites and social media channels promoting its "Loro Piana" mark, products and services.

On the question of "registration", the Complainant asserts the Respondent chose domain names that incorporate its well-known trademark without authority, together with geographic or other terms that Internet users would naturally associate with its "Loro Piana" trademark and its activities, so that the Respondent could not credibly have been unaware of the Complainant's rights.

On the question of "use", the Complainant points to active websites at some of the disputed domain names which offer counterfeit "Loro Piana" goods and reproduce copyrighted images from the official website, thereby damaging the Complainant's reputation and exposing consumers to fraud when they provide payment details.

The Complainant contends that all of this shows that the Respondent is intentionally attempting to attract users for commercial gain by creating confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement, while the remaining disputed domain names are passively held in circumstances that Panels have treated as bad faith use.

The Complainant also relies on previous Panel decisions said to show that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of abusive registrations, and contends that, taken together, these matters demonstrate bad faith registration and use of all the disputed domain names.

The Respondent has not filed any response in this proceeding and has therefore not rebutted the Complainant's contentions on bad faith registration and use.

In the circumstances, the Panel considers that the Respondent registered and is using each of the disputed domain names with the intention of exploiting the Complainant's "Loro Piana" trademark by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement for its own benefit.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that each of the disputed domain names has been registered and is being used in bad faith, and that the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy is made out.

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

Language of proceedings request

The Complainant requests that the language of this administrative proceeding be English, notwithstanding that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese.

Rule 11(a) of the UDRP rules states:

Unless otherwise agreed by the Parties, or specified otherwise in the Registration Agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the Registration Agreement, subject to the authority of the Panel to determine otherwise, having regard to the circumstances of the administrative proceeding.

In conducting the administrative proceeding, the Panel is required to ensure under Rule 10 of the UDRP rules that the Parties are treated with equality and be given a fair opportunity to present their case.

In support of this request, the Complainant provides the following supporting arguments and evidence.

- Neither the Complainant, nor its representatives, understands Chinese. It would, therefore, be quite burdensome and expensive for the Complainant to translate this Complaint with all its annexes. Moreover, requiring a Chinese translation of all documents would unnecessarily delay this procedure, while one of its main advantages is its short timeframe. The abusive use of each of the disputed domain names has already created substantial damages to the Complainant's image and reputation and extending the deadlines of this procedure would unduly increase these damages.
- The website to which the disputed domain name <loropiana-us.com> redirects is entirely in English.
- No words included in all of the disputed domain names are in the Chinese language;
- The Respondent's email included in the WHOIS is not written in Chinese.

While the Respondent appears to be located in China and the language of the Registration Agreement is in Chinese, the Panel considers that requiring the Complainant to translate the Complaint and annexes into Chinese would entail additional time and cost, without any clear corresponding benefit in terms of fairness to the Respondent.

The Respondent has been notified of this proceeding and of the Complainant's request regarding language but has not come forward, has not objected to English, and has not filed any administratively compliant response.

In these circumstances, the Panel is satisfied that proceeding in English will not unfairly prejudice the Respondent and is consistent with the objectives of efficiency and fairness reflected in the Rules.

Accordingly, the Panel determines that the language of this administrative proceeding shall be English.

Notification of proceedings to the Respondent

On March 18, 2026, the CAC by its non-standard communication stated as follows (omitting irrelevant parts):

"Please be aware that the CAC was not able to send the written notice to the Respondent as the address provided by the Registrar in Registrar verification does not exist. The postal service provider was not able to deliver a written notice to such an address.

No other address for correspondence was found on the disputed domain name.

As far as the e-mail notice is concerned, we received a confirmation that the e-mail notice sent to < postmaster@loropiana-jp.com>, <postmaster@loropiana-pt.com>, <postmaster@loropiana-tr.com>, <postmaster@loro-pianauk.com>, <postmaster@loropianaus.com> was returned back non-delivered as the e-mail address had permanent fatal errors. The e-mail notice was also sent to <verajenkins16208@hotmail.com>, but we never received any proof of delivery or notification of non-delivery.

No further e-mail address could be found on the disputed site.

The Respondent never accessed the online platform."

Given the reasonable measures employed by CAC as set out in the above non-standard communication, the Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under the UDRP were met and that there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

The Complainant owns multiple trademark registrations for the device mark "Loro Piana" in numerous jurisdictions, including international registrations designating China, as well as other national registrations, and uses the "Loro Piana" trademark to designate its goods and services.

The Respondent registered each of the disputed domain names after the Complainant had established its rights in the "Loro Piana" trademark.

The Complainant challenges the registration of each of the disputed domain names under paragraph 4(a) of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy, seeking transfer of each of the disputed domain names.

The Respondent has failed to file any administratively compliant response and has therefore not contested the Complainant's factual and legal contentions.

For the reasons articulated in the Panel's findings above, the Panel is satisfied that:

- Each of the disputed domain names is confusingly similar to the Complainant's "Loro Piana" trademark.
- The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of each of the disputed domain names.
- Each of the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **loropiana-jp.com**: Transferred
2. **loropiana-pt.com**: Transferred
3. **loropiana-tr.com**: Transferred
4. **loro-pianauk.com**: Transferred
5. **loropiana-us.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**William Lye OAM KC**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-03-30

Publish the Decision