Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108623

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108623
Time of filing	2026-05-07 14:29:49
Domain names	loropianafabricjackets.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Dvořáková (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Loro Piana S.p.A.

Complainant representative

Organization	Barzanò & Zanardo Milano S.p.A.

Respondent

Name	Mike Collins

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 is the owner of trademark registrations for figurative marks incorporating the words “LORO PIANA” (“the LORO PIANA mark”), including:

- European Union trademark registration No. 018162715, registered on May 22, 2020, in class 25;
- European Union trademark registration No. 007383136, registered on June 9, 2009, in classes 9, 14 and 35; and
- International trademark registration No. 1546962, registered on May 22, 2020, in class 25 and designating, inter alia, the United States.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, Loro Piana S.p.A., is an Italian company specializing in clothing and textile products. The Complainant states that it is a well-known luxury fashion and textile business, including in the production and promotion of cashmere and other luxury fibre products.

The Complainant has a total of 152 stores, of which 135 are directly operated. Its sales revenues in 2019 were 1 billion Euros.

The Complainant owns and operates its official domain name <loropiana.com>.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on March 9, 2026. At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website with the heading, “Loro Piana Fabric Luxury Jackets”, offering for sale jackets and cashmere garments bearing the “LORO PIANA” trade mark. The website also promoted “The White River Forest Jacket Incorporating Loro Piana Storm System Cashmere, by Michael Collins”.

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 confusingly similar to a trademark 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

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy requires a complainant to show that a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights.

The Complainant has provided evidence that it owns trademark rights in the LORO PIANA mark, which precedes the date of registration of the disputed domain name.

Although the trademark registrations cited in the Complaint are combination figurative & word marks, panel assessments of identity or confusing similarity involve comparing the domain name and the textual components of the relevant mark. The figurative elements would be largely disregarded for the purposes of assessing identity or confusing similarity under the first element. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.10.

In this case, the disputed domain name <loropianafabricjackets.com> incorporates the Complainant’s LORO PIANA mark in its entirety, with the addition of the descriptive terms “fabric” and “jackets”. The Complainant’s mark remains recognizable within the disputed domain name. The added terms “fabric” and “jackets” do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. On the contrary, those terms are descriptive of, or closely related to, the Complainant’s field of business. Where the relevant trade mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of descriptive or other terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element (see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8)

As for the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com”, it is well established that the gTLD is ordinarily disregarded in assessing identity or confusing similarity under the first element (see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11).

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Complainant has shown that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Once a complainant establishes a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the domain name, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to show that it has rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name (see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1).

In the present case, the Complainant has demonstrated a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and the Respondent has failed to assert any such rights or legitimate interests.

The Complainant has provided evidence that it has been the registered owner of the LORO PIANA mark long before the disputed domain name was registered. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the Complainant's LORO PIANA mark, and there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or any other name similar thereto.

The Respondent has used the disputed domain name for a website offering garments for sale under the LORO PIANA trade mark. The website does not clearly and prominently disclose the lack of a relationship or other connection with the Complainant. Rather, the composition of the disputed domain name and the content of the website create an impression of association with, or endorsement by, the Complainant.

The Panel has considered whether the Respondent could be making nominative or reseller-related use of the LORO PIANA mark. Such use may, in appropriate circumstances, support a right or legitimate interest only where the relevant requirements are met, including that the site must accurately and prominently disclose the registrant's relationship with the trademark holder and does not otherwise falsely suggest affiliation (see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.8.1). Those requirements are not met in this case.

In these circumstances, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has not filed any response or evidence to rebut the prima facie case established by the Complainant.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant must also show that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith (see Policy, paragraph 4(a)(iii)). Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides non-exhaustive circumstances that may evidence bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

It is self-evident on the record that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and its LORO PIANA mark at the time of registration of the domain name, and registered it with the Complainant's mark in mind, since the products offered on the associated website allegedly use Loro Piana fabric.

On the evidence before the Panel, the Respondent's website does not contain any clear and prominent disclaimer explaining that the Respondent is independent of, and unauthorized by, the Complainant. Hence, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name and website presentation is liable to create a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

Having considered the circumstances of this case, including: (i) the distinctive and well-known character of the Complainant's LORO PIANA mark; (ii) the Respondent's incorporation of that mark with descriptive terms in the disputed domain name; (iii) the Respondent's use of the website to offer garments for sale under the LORO PIANA mark; and (iv) the absence of any Response or other evidence in rebuttal, the Panel finds that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Accordingly, having regard to the circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that the Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 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. **loropianafabricjackets.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Francine Tan**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-06-08

Publish the Decision