Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108521

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108521
Time of filing	2026-03-27 08:30:01
Domain names	VERIFICA-INTESASANPAOLO.COM

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Intesa Sanpaolo S.p.A.

Complainant representative

Organization	Intesa Sanpaolo S.p.A.

Respondent

Name	Robert Bursvik

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

Intesa Sanpaolo S.p.A. (“Intesa Sanpaolo” or “Complainant”) is the owner of various registrations for the trademark INTESA SANPAOLO on a worldwide basis. One of them, the EU trademark Reg. No. 5301999 “INTESA SANPAOLO” was filed on September 8, 2006, granted on June 18, 2007 and duly renewed, in connection with the classes 35, 36 and 38. Moreover, the Complainant is also the owner, among others, of the following domain names bearing the signs “INTESA SANPAOLO” and “INTESA”: INTESASANPAOLO.COM, .ORG, .EU, .INFO, .NET, .BIZ, INTESA-SANPAOLO.COM, .ORG, .EU, .INFO, .NET, .BIZ and INTESA.COM, INTESA.INFO, INTESA.BIZ, INTESA.ORG, INTESA.US, INTESA.EU, INTESA.CN, INTESA.IN, INTESA.CO.UK, INTESA.TEL, INTESA.NAME, INTESA.XXX, INTESA.ME. All of them are now connected to the official website <http://www.intesasanpaolo.com>.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Intesa Sanpaolo is among the top banking groups in the euro zone, with a market capitalisation exceeding 87,48 billion euros, and the undisputed leader in Italy, in all business areas (retail, corporate and wealth management). Intesa Sanpaolo offers its services to approximately 13,9 million customers in Italy and 7,4 million in Central-Eastern Europe with a network of approximately 900 branches. Moreover, the international network specialised in supporting corporate customers is present in 25 countries.

The disputed domain name <verifica-intesasanpaolo.com> was registered on July 14, 2025, by Italian resident Robert Bursvik.

The disputed domain name is not used.

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 is confusingly similar to the Complainant's well-known trademark INTESA SANPAOLO. The disputed domain name <verifica-intesasanpaolo.com> exactly reproduces the trademark INTESA SANPAOLO and the addition of the term “verifica” is not sufficient to escape the finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark. On the contrary, the term “verifica” means “verification” or “identity check” in Italian; accordingly, the inclusion of this term may lead customers to believe that the website is intended for the verification of the identity of customers of the Complainant’s banking group.

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 (Robert Bursvik) does not resemble the disputed domain name in any manner. 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 INTESA SANPAOLO when he registered the disputed domain name <verifica-intesasanpaolo.com > (see WIPO Overview 3.0, para. 3.1.1). Previous UDRP panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) 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 is inactive. From the inception of the UDRP, previous panellists have found that the non-use of a domain

name (including a blank or “coming soon” page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. Having regard to the notoriety of the Complainant’s trademark, the failure of the Respondent to submit a response in this UDRP proceeding, the high probability of the Respondent’s use of false contact details and the implausibility of any good faith use, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith (section 3.3 of WIPO Overview 3.0).

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **VERIFICA-INTESASANPAOLO.COM**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Darius Sauliūnas**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-05-02

Publish the Decision