Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108946

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108946
Time of filing	2026-08-31 09:54:20
Domain names	BANCAINTENSASANPAOLO.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	jucelino rodrigues

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 the trade marks INTESA SANPAOLO, INTESA, and BANCA INTESA SANPAOLO. It has International and national trademark registrations including the following:

- International Trade Mark Registration No. 920896 for INTESA SANPAOLO, registered on March 7, 2007;
- International Trade Mark Registration No. 793367 for INTESA, registered on September 4, 2002;
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 5301999 for INTESA SANPAOLO, registered on June 18, 2007;
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 12247979 for INTESA, registered on March 5, 2014; and
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 5302377 for BANCA INTESA SANPAOLO, registered on July 6, 2007.

The Complainant owns and operates numerous domain names incorporating the INTESA SANPAOLO, INTESA, and BANCA INTESA SANPAOLO marks. These include: <intesasanpaolo.com>, <intesa-sanpaolo.com>, <intesa.com>, <intesa.info>, <bancaintesasanpaolo.com>, etc. All of the Complainant's domain names are connected to its official website at http://www.intesasanpaolo.com.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a leading Italian banking group formed through the merger between Banca Intesa S.p.A. and Sanpaolo IMI

S.p.A., two of Italy's leading banking groups.

The Complainant has a market capitalisation exceeding EUR119.89 billion. It operates a network of approximately 2,600 branches throughout Italy and holds a market share exceeding 12% in most Italian regions, serving approximately 13.9 million customers. The Complainant also maintains an international network supporting its corporate customers across 24 countries, with a particular presence in the Mediterranean region and in major economies including the United States, Russia, China and India.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 27, 2026. At the time of the filing of the Complaint, it does not resolve to any active webpage.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

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 trade mark 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. 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 submitted evidence establishing that it owns registered trademark rights in the INTESA SANPAOLO, INTESA, and BANCA INTESA SANPAOLO marks.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's marks, in particular its BANCA INTESA SANPAOLO trade mark.

The disputed domain name <bancaintensasanpaolo.com> incorporates the entirety of the BANCA INTESA SANPAOLO trade mark, save for the addition of the letter "n" to the element "intesa", resulting in "intensa". The Complainant's mark nevertheless remains

clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

As noted in section 1.9 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, a domain name consisting of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trade mark, often referred to as “typosquatting“, is generally considered confusingly similar to the relevant mark for the purposes of the first element. This is because the disputed domain name retains sufficiently recognizable aspects of the relevant mark.

The generic Top-Level Domain “.com” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity and is generally disregarded for the purposes of the comparison under the first element.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trade mark in which the Complainant has rights and has therefore satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

1. 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 of the domain names.

In the present case, the Complainant has established 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 acquired registered trademark rights in the INTESA SANPAOLO, INTESA, and BANCA INTESA SANPAOLO marks long before the disputed domain name was registered. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use any of its trade marks, and there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Respondent did not submit a Response and has therefore provided no explanation for its choice of the disputed domain name, nor any evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name 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 name and that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

1. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant must also establish 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 circumstances that may evidence bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

The Complainant’s BANCA INTESA SANPAOLO and related trade marks have been registered and used many years before the registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is also highly similar to the Complainant’s domain name <bancaintesasanpaolo.com>, differing only by the addition of the letter “n” to the element “intesa”.

The Panel agrees with the Complainant that the fact that the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website does not preclude a finding of bad faith registration and use.

It is well established under the doctrine of passive holding that the non-use of a domain name, including where it resolves to a blank or “coming soon” page, does not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith. Rather, panels assess the totality of the circumstances in determining whether the passive holding of a domain name constitutes bad faith for the purposes of the Policy. (See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3.)

Factors that panels have considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include, among others:

the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant’s mark; and

the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use.

In the present case, the Complainant’s INTESA SANPAOLO, INTESA, and BANCA INTESA SANPAOLO trade marks are distinctive and well known. Given the close similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s BANCA INTESA SANPAOLO mark and domain name, the Panel considers it clear that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trade marks when registering the disputed domain name, and that the disputed domain name was registered with those marks in mind. A basic Internet search for “INTESA SANPAOLO”, “INTESA”, or “BANCA INTESA SANPAOLO” would readily have disclosed references to the Complainant.

The Respondent has failed to submit a Response and has provided no evidence of any actual or contemplated good-faith use of the disputed domain name, or otherwise to rebut the Complainant’s case.

Accordingly, having regard to the totality of the circumstances, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith and that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of 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. **BANCAINTENSASANPAOLO.COM**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Francine Tan**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-09-24

Publish the Decision