Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108395

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108395
Time of filing	2026-02-23 09:44:55
Domain names	loropiana-nl.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	Patience Tougas

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

Loro Piana S.p.A. (the "Complainant") is the owner of the European Union trademark LORO PIANA (Reg. No. 007383136), registered on June 9, 2009, in classes 9, 14 and 35.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is an Italian luxury fashion brand specialized in textile manufacturing and ready-to-wear clothing headquartered in Milan, considered one of the world's largest cashmere manufacturers and the leading artisan company processing luxury fibers. The company reached the 1-billion-euro sales mark in 2019.

The Complainant, founded in 1924 by Pietro Loro Piana, an Italian engineer, in the Quarona commune of Piedmont, has been for decades led by the Loro Piana Family. The company evolved from a focus on developing high-quality fabrics, such as cashmere and fine wool, into a diversified luxury brand offering ready-to-wear clothing and premium goods by the late 1990s. It is therefore globally well-known as the leading the leading artisan company processing luxury fibers. Loro Piana goods are sold both online and in luxury stores across Europe (including the Netherlands) and the USA.

The Complainant also owns domain names containing the trademark LORO PIANA, such as the domain names <loropiana.com>, <loropiana.it>, etc.

The disputed domain name <loropiana-nl.com > was registered on November 15, 2025, i.e. many years after the first registration of the Complainant's LORO PIANA globally well-known trademark, and resolved to a commercial website where, in the absence of any disclaimer of non-affiliation, the Complainant's trademark features prominently, along with alleged LORO PIANA products (offered at significantly discounted prices using copyrighted images of the Complainant).

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

The Panel agrees with the Complainant that the disputed domain name <loropiana-nl.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark LORO PIANA. The evidence presented by the Complainant shows the extensive use of its trademark internationally and it is, therefore, regarded as the well-known trademark. The Panel agrees with the Complainant that the addition of country code "-nl" to the well-known sign does not set aside the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark (see section 1.8 of WIPO Overview 3.0). On the contrary, the addition of the Dutch country code "-nl" directly refers to the Complainant's sales and marketing activities in the Netherlands.

The Panel acknowledges that the Complainant presented prima facie evidence that the Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with Complainant in any way. Furthermore, the Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or permitted Respondent to use Complainant's trademarks in any manner, including in domain names. The Respondent's name does not resemble the disputed domain name in any manner.

The nature of the disputed domain name, juxtaposing the LORO PIANA mark with the country code of the Netherlands ("-nl"), creates a high risk of implied affiliation and cannot constitute fair use (see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.5.1: 'Even where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term (at the second- or top-level), UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner.'). Internet users reading the disputed domain name are likely to believe it is held/used by the Complainant, or an entity authorised by the Complainant, for a legitimate commercial purpose (e.g., to advertise and reflect the Complainant's LORO PIANA offerings in the Netherlands). Therefore, Respondent's use of the disputed domain name does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

On these bases, the Panel concludes that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in regard to the disputed domain name.

As no administratively compliant response has been provided to the Panel and the prima facie evidence was not challenged by the Respondent, the Panel concludes that the Respondent meant Complainant's trademark LORO PIANA, when he/she registered the disputed domain name <loropiana-nl.com> (see WIPO Overview 3.0, para. 3.1.3 and 3.2). Previous UDRP panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

The disputed domain name was used in connection with a commercial website on which, in the absence of any disclaimer of non-affiliation, the Complainant's trademark was prominently displayed, together with purported LORO PIANA products offered at significantly discounted prices and featuring the Complainant's copyrighted images. This indicates that the Respondent may have derived financial gain from the sale of counterfeit goods on the website associated with the disputed domain name. In conclusion, the Respondent was using the disputed domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's LINDT trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. Therefore, this is nothing else but the use of the domain name in bad faith (para. 4(b)(iv) of the Policy).

In view of the foregoing, the Panel has concluded that the disputed domain name was, both, registered and used in bad faith (Para. 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **loropiana-nl.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Darius Sauliūnas**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-03-29

Publish the Decision