

## Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108685

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108685
Time of filing	2026-05-29 09:40:07
Domain names	moon-boot-nz.com, moonboots-australia.com, moonbootsuk.com

### Case administrator

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

### Complainant

Organization	TECNICA GROUP S.P.A.
--------------	----------------------

### Complainant representative

Organization	Convey srl
--------------	------------

### Respondent

Name	(Huang Baochuan)
------	------------------

#### 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 names.

#### IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant has been the owner of the trade mark MOON BOOT since 1978. It has International and national trademark registrations including the following:

- International Trade Mark Registration No. 438194 for MOON BOOT, registered on May 25, 1978;
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 000516880 for MOON BOOT, registered on November 18, 1999;
- International Trade Mark Registration No. 917027 for MOON BOOT, with a designation extension to China, registered on January 11, 2007;
- International Trade Mark Registration No. 1774755 for MOON BOOT, registered on December 27, 2023; and

- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 018669427 for MOON BOOTS, registered on July 6, 2022.

The Complainant owns and operates domain names incorporating the MOON BOOT mark, including <moonboot.com>, registered on March 2, 2011; <moonboot.it>, registered on October 11, 2000; <moonboot.eu>, registered on June 5, 2006, and <moonboot.cn>, registered on January 18, 2012.

---

#### FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is an Italian sports equipment company, active in the sector of footwear and winter sports equipment. MOON BOOT is one of the Complainant's snow boot brands, first created as après-ski wear in the early 1970s. The Complainant has since sold about 25 million pairs of MOON BOOT snow boots. The Complainant's MOON BOOT snow boots became popular in the years following the Apollo 11 moon landing and resurfaced as a retro futuristic fashion trend in the early 2000s. Over the years, the Complainant has collaborated with a number of well-known fashion and luxury brands, including Moncler, Jimmy Choo, Swarovski, Chanel, GCDS, Jeremy Scott, and MSGM.

The disputed domain names <moon-boot-nz.com> and <moonboots-australia.com> were registered on December 16, 2025; the disputed domain name <moonbootsuk.com> was registered on December 15, 2025.

The disputed domain names resolved to websites which reproduced the MOON BOOT trade mark, displayed product images of MOON BOOT footwear, and offered MOON BOOT-branded products for sale.

Cease and desist letters were sent to the Respondent on March 19, 2026. The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's letters

---

#### PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain names 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 names are 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 names (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 names have been registered and are being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

---

#### PROCEDURAL FACTORS

##### A. Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement is in Chinese. The Respondent requested that English be the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.5.1).

The Panel determines that English shall be the appropriate language of the proceeding in this case. The disputed domain names comprise English terms - MOON BOOT/MOON BOOTS - and English geographic abbreviations, namely "NZ", "UK" and "Australia". The websites to which the disputed domain names resolved featured English-language content. The website to which the <moonbootsuk.com> domain name resolved has been targeted at Internet users located in the UK. The Respondent has not participated in the proceeding or objected to the Complainant's request for the language of the proceeding to be English. Requiring translation of the Complaint into Chinese would cause additional delay and expense.

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 registered trademark rights in the MOON BOOT and MOON BOOTS marks.

The Panel finds that each of the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's MOON BOOT marks.

- The disputed domain name <moon-boot-nz.com> incorporates the Complainant's MOON BOOT mark in its entirety, with the space between "MOON" and "BOOT" replaced by a hyphen. The additional element "nz" is a geographic abbreviation for New Zealand.
- The disputed domain name <moonboots-australia.com> incorporates the Complainant's MOON BOOTS mark with the omission of the space between "MOON" and "BOOTS" and the addition of the letter "s". The additional term "australia" is a geographic name.
- The disputed domain name <moonbootsuk.com> incorporates the Complainant's MOON BOOTS mark with the omission of the space between "MOON" and "BOOTS" and the addition of the letter "s". The additional element "uk" is a geographic abbreviation for the United Kingdom.

The addition of the elements "nz", "Australia", and "uk" in the respective domain names does not remove the confusing similarity between the domain names and the Complainant's MOON BOOT/ MOON BOOTS marks. (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 not relevant to the issue of identity or confusing similarity between a complainant's trade mark and the domain name in dispute.

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Complainant has shown that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to a trade mark in which the Complainant has rights.

##### B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Once the complainant establishes a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the domain names, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to show that it has rights or legitimate interests in respect to the domain names.

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 names 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 MOON BOOT trade mark long before the date that the disputed domain names were registered. It has not authorized the Respondent to use the Complainant's trade marks and is not an authorized reseller of MOON BOOT products. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names.

The disputed domain names resolved to websites reproducing the MOON BOOT mark and purporting to offer MOON BOOT-branded footwear, including at discounted prices. The websites presented themselves as MOON BOOT online stores, used similar layouts, displayed the Complainant's mark prominently, and did not disclose any absence of affiliation with the Complainant. Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain names.

The Respondent did not submit a Response and did not provide any explanation for its choice of the disputed domain names nor evidence to show rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names which would be sufficient to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case.

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

##### C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant must also show that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith (see Policy,

paragraph 4(a)(iii)). Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides circumstances that may evidence bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

The Complainant's MOON BOOT mark has been used and registered many years before the disputed domain names were registered. Each of the disputed domain names incorporates the MOON BOOT mark, or the MOON BOOTS mark, together with geographic terms or abbreviations. The Respondent also reproduced the MOON BOOT mark on the websites corresponding to the disputed domain names and used those websites to offer MOON BOOT-branded footwear for sale. In these circumstances, it is clear to the Panel that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its MOON BOOT marks when registering the disputed domain names, and that the disputed domain names were registered with the Complainant's trade marks in mind.

The Respondent's use of the disputed domain names falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. By using the disputed domain names to operate websites impersonating official or authorized MOON BOOT online stores, the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

Further, the registration of three disputed domain names incorporating the Complainant's MOON BOOT mark and following the same naming pattern, namely the addition of a geographical name or abbreviation, indicates a pattern of conduct targeted at the Complainant's trade mark.

The Respondent failed to submit a Response and provided no evidence to rebut the Complainant's case. 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. **moon-boot-nz.com**: Transferred
2. **moonboots-australia.com**: Transferred
3. **moonbootsuk.com**: Transferred

---

## **PANELLISTS**

Name	<b>Francine Tan</b>
------	---------------------

---

DATE OF PANEL DECISION **2026-07-03**

---

**Publish the Decision**

---