Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108707

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108707
Time of filing	2026-06-10 10:05:05
Domain names	EURIZONINVESTMENT.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	Steve Jones

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 several trademarks for the word 'EURIZON' as well as trademarks for 'EURIZON INVESTIMENTI'. These include EU trademark registration no. 13847587 'EURIZON', which was registered on 31 August 2015, for various goods and services in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 41, and 42 (hereinafter referred to as the "Trademark").

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a leading Italian banking group. It is the company resulting from the merger (effective as of 1 January 2007) between Banca Intesa S.p.A. and Sanpaolo IMI S.p.A., two Italian banking groups. The Complainant has a market capitalisation exceeding €99.09 billion, provides its services to approximately 14 million customers, and is the leader in Italy with a network of approximately 2,600 branches and a market share of more than 12% in most Italian regions. Furthermore, the Complainant has a strong presence in Central and Eastern Europe with a network of approximately 900 branches and over 7.4 million customers.

Eurizon Capital SGR is the Complainant's asset management company, specialising in products for retail and institutional customers. It manages assets of approximately €394.6 billion. Eurizon Capital SGR owns further companies, namely Eurizon Capital SA in Luxembourg and Eurizon SLJ Capital Limited in the United Kingdom. The principal website of Eurizon Capital SGR is available at https://www.eurizoncapital.com/.

The disputed domain name was registered on 20 August 2025 and is being used in connection with a website offering various financial services. The website includes company information relating to the Complainant, such as 'Eurizon Investment SICAV', which is a collective investment undertaking forming part of the Complainant's Asset Management division, as well as the LEI code of that company.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark, as it reproduces the well-known Trademark with the mere addition of the term 'INVESTMENT', with obvious references to the financial services offered by the Complainant to its customers and also to the Complainant's trademark 'EURIZON INVESTIMENTI'.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In this regard, the Complainant states that no one has been authorised or licensed by the above-mentioned banking group to use the disputed domain name, that the disputed domain name does not correspond to the name of the Respondent, that the Respondent is not commonly known as 'EURIZONINVESTMENT', and that the disputed domain name is not being used in a fair or non-commercial manner.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In this regard, the Complainant contends that the Trademark is distinctive and well known throughout the world, that it is more than likely that the disputed domain name would not have been registered but for the Trademark, and that the Respondent had knowledge of the Trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name.

As to bad faith use, the Complainant states that, by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has 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 the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website, pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Complainant further argues that the disputed domain name is connected to a website promoting banking and financial services for which the Complainant's trademarks are registered and used, and that the website reproduces the name 'Eurizon Investment SICAV' (referring to a company which forms part of the Complainant's Asset Management division) and provides various details identifying it, and that it is obvious that the Respondent is seeking to capitalise on the Trademark.

RESPONDENT:

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

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the following three elements is present:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; and

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

1. The Panel accepts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark, as it fully incorporates the well-established Trademark and merely includes the descriptive term 'investment' at the end of the second-level domain name. The Trademark, however, is clearly recognisable in the disputed domain name.

2. The Complainant has substantiated that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that the Complainant has fulfilled its obligations under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. The Respondent did not deny these assertions in any way and therefore failed to prove any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Based on the evidence before the Panel, the Panel is unable to find any rights or legitimate interests on the part of the Respondent either. In particular, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name in connection with banking and financial services, and the fact that the Respondent is using business information relating to the Complainant's business, clearly demonstrate that the Respondent is deliberately targeting the Complainant's business and the Trademark. Such use constitutes trade mark infringement but does not give rise to any rights or legitimate interests in favour of the Respondent. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has proven that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraphs 4(a)(ii) and 4(c) of the Policy.

3. The Panel is also satisfied that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant and its rights in the Trademark, as the Trademark is highly distinctive and well established, and as the Respondent is deliberately targeting one of the Complainant's companies in Luxembourg. It is inconceivable that the disputed domain name was registered without the Complainant and the Trademark in mind.

As to bad faith use, by using the disputed domain name in connection with the website described above, the Respondent was, in all likelihood, seeking to divert traffic intended for the Complainant's website to its own, for commercial gain, as set out in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **EURIZONINVESTMENT.COM**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Peter Müller**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-07-14

Publish the Decision