Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108468

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108468
Time of filing	2026-04-10 07:50:25
Domain names	loropianagstaad.com

Case administrator

Organization	Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Loro Piana S.p.A.

Complainant representative

Organization	Barzanò & Zanardo Milano S.p.A.

Respondent

Name	Stefan Tudor

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 owns various trade mark registrations which incorporate its LORO PIANA trade mark including the following:

(i) LORO PIANA (device), EU Reg. no. 018162715, filed on December 10th, 2019 and registered on May 22nd 2020, in class 25; and

(ii) LORO PIANA (device), EU Reg. no. 007383136, filed on November 11th, 2008 and registered on June 9th, 2009, in class 9, 14 and 35.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is an Italian company specialized in clothing and textile products. It is considered one of the largest cashmere manufacturers and one of the leading artisanal processors of luxury fibers. The Complainant has a total of 152 stores worldwide, of which 135 are directly operated. It has secured locations for outlets in Doha, Qatar, and Palo Alto, California over the next 12 months. By 2019, the Complainant had reached a turnover of one billion euros per annum. The Complainant is active on several social networks, such as Facebook on which it has almost 100.000 followers and Instagram where it has one million followers. It owns the domain name <loropiana.com> from which it operates its own website and offers its products for sale.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 16, 2026 and resolves to an inactive 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.

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

However, an e-mail was sent to the Centre by the Respondent on April 15, 2026 advising that the Respondent had registered the disputed domain name for the purposes of a "school project" together with one other domain name incorporating the "LORO PIANA" mark but had completely forgotten about them and invited the Centre to confirm how he could transfer them. The Centre invited the parties to discuss a settlement but received no further correspondence.

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 Complainant has demonstrated that it owns registered trade mark rights for its LORO PIANA mark as set out above. Although these are both combined device and word marks the LORO PIANA word mark is a dominant element of each of the marks. As the LORO PIANA word mark is wholly incorporated into the disputed domain name the panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's registered trade marks. The addition of the geographic term "Gstaad" does not distinguish the disputed domain name or prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant has submitted that the Respondent is neither an authorised dealer, agent, distributor or reseller of LORO PIANA products and that he has not been authorised to register and use the LORO PIANA trade mark in a domain name. The Complainant has also submitted that the disputed domain name re-directs to an inactive website and has not been used for a bona fide offering of goods and services nor for legitimate non-commercial activity. The Complainant has also submitted that as the disputed domain name contains the very well reputed LORO PIANA mark it is difficult to see how it could be used in a fair and legitimate manner.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has made out a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent indicated in his email to the Center that he had forgotten that he had registered the disputed domain name for the purposes of a school project. Noting the degree of international repute attaching to the "Loro Piana" brand and that the Respondent had also registered a second domain name containing the Complainant's mark and in circumstances that there was no further explanation from the Respondent and for the reasons stated below, the Panel remains sceptical of the Respondent's real intent and finds that he has failed to rebut the prima facie case made out by the Complainant. Accordingly, the Complaint succeeds under the second element of the Policy.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 16, 2026 many years after the registration of the Complainant's trade marks as noted above. The Complainant's "Loro Piana" brand and business was very well established internationally by this date and in

view of its level of distinctiveness the Panel finds that the Respondent was more than likely to have been well aware of the Complainant's LORO PIANA mark and business at the date of registration of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name resolves to an inactive website and has been held passively. The Panel notes that in terms of section 3.3 of the WIPO overview 3.1, panels have found factors relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine including: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, (iii) the respondent's taking active steps to conceal its identity or (iv) the use of false or inaccurate contact details (noted to be in breach of the respondent's registration agreement).

The LORO PIANA mark is distinctive and very well reputed as a consequence of the Complainant's very sizeable and established international business under the mark. The Respondent's very brief email explanation that he "forgot" about the disputed domain after only registering it a few months earlier and his confirmation that he had also registered another domain name incorporating the "Loro Piana" mark and that both had been registered for the purposes of a school project, rings rather hollow.

Registering not one but two domain names containing very well reputed marks, in particular containing the name of a well known upmarket destination such as Gstaad, being a location to which the Complainant may wish to expand in the future, is unlikely to have been in good faith. The Respondent's suggestion that he had forgotten about the domain name registrations merely a few months after their registration is just not a credible excuse. Further, in these circumstances using a privacy service to mask his identity only affirms the Panel's view of the implausibility of the Respondent's explanation and of the likelihood that he registered the disputed domain name in bad faith. As a result, the Complaint succeeds under the third element of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **loropianagstaad.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Mr Alistair Payne**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-05-26

Publish the Decision