Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108577

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108577
Time of filing	2026-04-16 09:47:59
Domain names	SUPPORTINTESASANPAOLO.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	Francesco Luongo

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 bases its Complaint, among others, on the following trademarks:

- International trademark registration “INTESA SANPAOLO”, no. 920896, registered on 07.03.2007, for goods and services in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 41, and 42, designating several countries for protection;
- International trademark registration “INTESA”, no. 793367, registered on 04.09.2002, for services in class 36, designating several countries for protection;
- EU trademark registration “INTESA SANPAOLO”, no. 5301999, filed on 08.09.2006, registered on 18.06.2007, for services in classes 35, 36 and 38;
- EU trademark registration “INTESA”, no. 12247979, filed on 23.10.2013, registered on 05.03.2014, for goods and services in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 38, 41 and 42.

In addition, the Complainant holds, among others, the following domain names which include the denominations “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, INTESA-SUPPORTA.COM. All of them are connected to the official website http://www.intesasanpaolo.com.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is Intesa Sanpaolo S.p.A., a leading Italian banking group and also one of the protagonists in the European financial arena. Intesa Sanpaolo is the company resulting from the merger (effective as of January 1, 2007) between Banca Intesa S.p.A. and Sanpaolo IMI S.p.A., two of the top Italian banking groups.

Intesa Sanpaolo is among the top banking groups in the euro zone, with a market capitalisation exceeding 100,09 billion euro, and the undisputed leader in Italy, in all business areas (retail, corporate and wealth management). Thanks to a network of approximately 2,600 branches capillary and well distributed throughout the country, with market shares of more than 13% in most Italian regions, the Group offers its services to approximately 13,9 million customers. Intesa Sanpaolo has a strong presence in Central-Eastern Europe with a network of approximately 900 branches and over 7,4 million customers. Moreover, the international network specialised in supporting corporate customers is present in 24 countries, in particular in the Mediterranean area and those areas where Italian companies are most active, such as the United States, Russia, China and India.

The Complainant owns trademarks INTESA SANPAOLO and INTESA, as cited above, as well as a portfolio of domain names comprising the trademarks INTESA SANPAOLO and INTESA.

The disputed domain name <supportintesasanpaolo.com> was registered on 13.11.2025 and resolves to a webpage that presents information about recovering the domain name, finding a similar domain name as well as about creating a website.

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.

The Complainant's contentions are the following:

The disputed domain name <supportintesasanpaolo.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks INTESA SANPAOLO and INTESA, that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name for a number of reasons and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the 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).

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

1. Confusing Similarity

The Panel agrees that the disputed domain name <supportintesasanpaolo.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks INTESA SANPAOLO and INTESA. The disputed domain name incorporates entirely the Complainant's earlier INTESA SANPAOLO trademark with the addition of the generic term "support" in front of it, which is not sufficient to prevent the finding that the domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

Moreover, the extension ".com" is not to be taken into consideration when examining the similarity between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name (WIPO Case No. D2005-0016, Accor v. Noldc Inc.). The mere adjunction of a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") such as ".com" is irrelevant as it is well established that the generic Top Level Domain is insufficient to avoid a finding of confusing similarity (WIPO Case No. 2013-0820, L'Oréal v Tina Smith, WIPO Case No. D2008-0820 Titoni AG v Runxin Wang and WIPO Case No. D2009-0877, Alstom v. Itete Peru S.A.).

Therefore, the Panel is satisfied that the first condition under the Policy is met.

2. Lack of Respondent's rights or legitimate interests

The Complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. Once such a prima facie case is made, the burden of proof shifts to the respondent to come forward with appropriate allegations or evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. If the respondent fails to come forward with such appropriate allegations or evidence, a complainant is generally deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP.

Based on the available evidence, the Respondent does not appear to be known by the disputed domain name as such is not identified in the WHOIS database as the disputed domain name or by the terms "intesa sanpaolo" and/or "intesa". The Complainant has never authorised the Respondent to make use of its trademark, nor of a confusingly similar trademark in the disputed domain name.

Based on the available evidence, the disputed domain name resolves to a webpage that presents information about recovering the domain name, finding a similar domain name as well as about creating a website.

The above does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services, or to a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes that the Respondent had an opportunity to comment on the Complaint's allegations by filing a Response, which the Respondent failed to do.

Thus, the Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has at least established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the Panel takes the view that also the second requirement under the Policy is met.

3. Bad Faith

Based on the available evidence, the Complainant's INTESA SANPAOLO and INTESA trademarks predate the registration date of the disputed domain name. Thus, the Respondent has chosen to register the disputed domain name which incorporates entirely the Complainant's earlier INTESA SANPAOLO trademark with the addition of the generic term "support" in front of it, in order to create a confusion with such trademark. Therefore, the Panel concludes that at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant's INTESA SANPAOLO and INTESA trademarks and has intentionally registered one in order to create confusion with such trademarks.

In the present case, the following factors should be considered:

(i) the Complainant's trademarks INTESA SANPAOLO and INTESA trademarks predate the registration date of the disputed domain name and are well-known ones;

(ii) the Respondent failed to submit any response and has not provided any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use of the disputed domain name;

(iii) the Respondent registered the disputed domain name by incorporating in its entirety the Complainant's earlier INTESA SANPAOLO trademark with the addition of the generic term "support" in front of it, which might correspond to services that might be offered by the Complainant;

(iv) the disputed domain name resolves to a webpage that presents information about recovering the domain name, finding a similar domain name as well as about creating a website, and

(v) any good faith use of the disputed domain name would be implausible, as the trademarks INTESA SANPAOLO and INTESA are univocally linked to the Complainant and the Respondent has no business relationship with the Complainant, nor was ever authorised to use a domain name confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks.

In light of the foregoing, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has registered and has been using the disputed domain name in bad faith. Thus, also the third and last condition under 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. **SUPPORTINTESASANPAOLO.COM**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Delia-Mihaela Belciu**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-05-18

Publish the Decision