

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108892

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108892
Time of filing	2026-09-02 13:36:40
Domain names	10-corsocomo.com, corsocomo-10.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)
------	-----------------------------

Complainant

Organization	TFC SRL
--------------	---------

Complainant representative

Organization	Barzanò & Zanardo Milano S.p.A.
--------------	---------------------------------

Respondents

Name	Louis Hill
Name	Kenneth Weiher

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 provided evidence of its ownership of registered trademark rights in the trademark “10 CORSO COMO” in numerous jurisdictions:

- 10 CORSO COMO, EU Reg. No. 007251143, registered on November 11, 2009 in classes 3, 9, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21, 25, 35, 41, 43;
- 10 CORSO COMO, International Reg. No. 1030234, registered on December 11, 2009 in classes 03, 09, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21, 25, 35, 41, 43;
- 10 CORSO COMO CAFÉ (device), International Reg. No. 1282731, registered on July 13, 2015 designating among the others China in classes 08, 16, 21, 24, 29, 30, 32, 33, 35, 43.

The trademarks are still valid at present and their registration dates predate the registration dates of the disputed domain names.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A. Complainant's Factual Allegations

The Complainant has since 1990 operated a store in Milan, Italy under the name "10 Corso Como" from which it sells a wide array of products, including apparel, footwear, jewellery, fragrances, bags, housewares, kitchenware, books, paper products and food products. Since the time that it opened its first store in Milan, the Complainant has opened additional locations in Seoul, Shanghai, Beijing and New York City. The Complainant maintains an active website at the domain name <10corsocomo.com>, where it posts an assortment of information about the store, and through which it conducts a brisk e-commerce business, selling everything from books to jewellery to beauty products to housewares to bags and apparel.

B. Respondents' Factual Allegations

The Respondents have defaulted in this UDRP administrative proceeding and have consequently made no factual allegations. The Respondent of <10-corsocomo.com> is Louis Hill, based at the address of 2410 87th St, Lubbock, TX, United States. The Respondent of <corsocomo-10.com> is Kenneth Weiher, based at the address of 3503 Elm Hollow St. San Antonio, Post Code 3503, United States.

The disputed domain name, <10-corsocomo.com>, was registered on July 2, 2026. The disputed domain name, <corsocomo-10.com>, was registered on July 23, 2026. Both domain names resolve to websites that sell a wide range of products including apparel, fragrances, bags, shoes, accessories.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

A. COMPLAINANT

Consolidation Request

The Complainant requests the consolidation of the disputed domain names in a single UDRP proceeding.

Paragraph 10(e) of the Rules grants the Panel to "decide a request by a Party to consolidate multiple domain name disputes in accordance with the Policy and these Rules".

Where a complaint is filed against multiple respondents, panels look at whether (i) the domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control, and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties. Procedural efficiency would also underpin panel consideration of such a consolidation scenario.

Panels have considered a range of factors, typically present in some combination, as useful to determining whether such consolidation is appropriate, such as similarities in or relevant aspects of (i) the registrants' identity(ies) including pseudonyms, (ii) the registrants' contact information including email address(es), postal address(es), or phone number(s), including any pattern of irregularities, (iii) relevant IP addresses, name servers, or webhost(s), (iv) the content or layout of websites corresponding to the disputed domain names, (v) the nature of the marks at issue (e.g., where a registrant targets a specific sector), (vi) any naming patterns in the disputed domain names.

In the present case, numerous elements show a common control and support a consolidation request:

- The disputed domain names have been all registered in the same period of time, July 2026. <10-corsocomo.com> was registered on July 2, 2026. <corsocomo-10.com> was registered on July 23, 2026;
- They reflect a clear naming pattern as all the domain names are composed by "CORSOCOMO" associated to "-" and "10" which are before and after the trademark;
- They redirect to websites which are very similar;
- They were registered by US based entities using email address created with the service of "@163.com".

Language of the Proceedings

The Complainant was submitted in English. According to the Registrar's verification, the language of the registration agreement is Chinese. The Complainant submitted a request for English to be the language of this administrative proceeding in light of the following circumstances:

- The Complainant does not understand Chinese. It is quite burdensome and expensive to translate the Complaint. Requiring a Chinese translation would delay the procedure;
- The websites to which the disputed domain names redirect are in English and Italian;
- No words included in all the disputed domain names are in Chinese language;
- The Respondents are both US based citizens.

The Complainant's contentions can be summarized as follows:

I. The disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark in which the Complainant has rights

The disputed domain names reproduce the Complainant's trademark in its entirety. In UDRP cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark under the first element of the Policy.

II. The Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names

The Complainant contends that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names on the grounds: i) they are not the authorized dealers, agents, distributors or resellers of the Complainant and they are not authorized to register and use the Complainant's trademark in a domain name; ii) paragraph 4(c) of the Policy lists a series of circumstances, which, if satisfied, prove that the Respondent owns rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. However, the Respondents failed to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names; iii) the disputed domain names resolve to commercial websites. The Respondents are gaining from the sales of the products by exploiting the Complainant's trademarks.

III. The Respondents registered and are using the disputed domain names in bad faith

The Complainant submits that the Respondents registered and are using the disputed domain names in bad faith on the grounds: i) regarding registration in bad faith, they have registered the disputed domain names that contain entirely the well-known "10CORSOCOMO" trademark without the Complainant's authorization. They could not ignore the existence of the "10CORSOCOMO" trademark at the time of the registration of the disputed domain names, because in the "About Us" section they clearly refer to the Complainant's first iconic shop located in Milan under the brand "10CORSOCOMO". The websites both promote and sell "10CORSOCOMO" alleged products; ii) regarding use in bad faith, the disputed domain names are both used in connection with websites that could create the impression of being part of the Complainant's official network. The "About us" section of both websites contains numerous references to the Complainant's iconic shop in Milan and to the "10CORSOCOMO" brand; iii) the websites promote third parties trademark, which means that the "10CORSOCOMO" trademark is used to promote products distinguished by other trademarks integrating an additional element of use in bad faith.

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain names should be transferred to it.

B. RESPONDENTS

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain names are 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 Respondents 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

Consolidation Request

The Complainant requests the consolidation of the disputed domain names in a single UDRP proceeding.

Paragraph 10(e) of the Rules provides that a panel shall decide a request by a Party to consolidate multiple domain name disputes in accordance with the Policy and the Rules.

Paragraph 4.16 of WIPO Overview 3.0 mentions: WIPO panels have articulated principles governing the question of whether a complaint filed with WIPO by multiple complainants may be brought against (one or more) respondents. These criteria encompass situations in which (i) the complainants either have a specific common grievance against the respondent, or the respondent has engaged in common conduct that has affected the complainants' individual rights in a similar fashion; (ii) it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to permit the consolidation; or in the case of complaints brought (whether or not filed by multiple complainants) against more than one respondent, where (i) the domain names or the websites to which they resolve are subject to common control, and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties.

A consolidation may be appropriate where the panel finds that the following two factors are present:

- The domain names or the websites to which they resolve are subject to common control. As noted by the panel in *Speedo Holdings B.V. v. Programmer, Miss Kathy Beckerson, John Smitt, Matthew Simmons*, WIPO Case No. D2010-0281, indicia of common control have been found based on commonalities in registrant information, such as shared administrative or technical contacts and shared postal or email addresses, as well as other circumstances in the record indicating that the respondents are related or that a sufficient unity of interests otherwise exists that they may be essentially treated as a single domain name holder for purposes of paragraph 3(c) of the Rules.
- The consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties.

See Case No. D2015-2323:

Yahoo! Inc. v. Mahesh Rohatgi / Prakhar Rastogi, Bestwebexperts.com / Prakhar Rastogi, Best Web Experts / Privacy Protection Service INC d/b/a PrivacyProtect.org / Prashant Mishra, Vipra Busines Solution / Rina Rohatgi / Wemo Tech Support / Charu Rohatgi / Alina Jain / Raju Hirani, Alfa Infosystem / Brijesh Pandey, IBS Infosystem / Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC / Amit Singh / Satya Prakash / Rajveer Singh Chawla / Pooja Pandey, Innovative Business Solutions.

In relation to each of the two factors for the consolidation of a complaint outlined above, the Complainant argues that:

- The disputed domain names have all been registered in the same period of time;
- They reflect a clear naming pattern as all the domain names are composed by "CORSOCOMO" associated to "-" and "10" which are before and after the trademark;
- They redirect to websites which are very similar;
- They were registered by US-based entities using email addresses created with the service of "@163.com".

The Panel accepts the Complainant's argument that the disputed domain names are subject to common control. The Panel notes the following two more circumstances:

The language of the registration agreements of both disputed domain names is in Chinese;

The Respondents of both disputed domain names are companies located on the same street with street No. 62 and No. 64 in Chengdu City, China.

The Panel also finds that the consolidation of these disputes would be fair and equitable. See CAC-UDRP-108914, *Husqvarna AB v. jianbing gan, yilei zhang, Zhiyuan Wu, Qingming Dong, Gang Qin, Mary Barnhartar*.

In view of the above circumstances, the Panel agrees to the consolidation of the Complaint in relation to each of the disputed domain names.

Language of the proceedings

The language of the registration agreement is Chinese. The Complainant has requested that the language of the proceedings be English. The Respondents did not respond to the issue of the language of the proceedings and did not reject the Complainant's request.

The Panel is given discretion under Paragraph 11 of the Rules to determine the appropriate language of the administrative proceeding. Paragraph 10 of the Rules mentions that the Panel shall ensure that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case. Based on the following factors, the Panel has decided that it would be fair and equitable to all parties to have the language of the proceedings be English:

- The Complaint was written in English, an international language comprehensible to a wide range of internet users worldwide, including those living in China;
- The Respondents understand English. The websites to which the disputed domain names redirect are in English and Italian. The Respondents are both US based citizens;
- While determining the language of the administrative proceedings, the Panel has a duty to consider who would suffer the greatest inconvenience as a result of the Panel's determination. On the one hand, the determination of English as the language of this administrative proceeding – a widely spoken language – is unlikely to cause the Respondent any inconvenience. The determination of Chinese as the language of this administrative proceeding, on the other hand, is very likely to cause the Complainant inconvenience, and to interfere with the overall due expedition of the proceedings under the Rules. See CAC-UDRP-106643, *Burberry Limited v Fei Cheng*;
- The Complainant has requested that the language of the proceedings be English. The Respondent did not respond to reject its request.

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

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that in order to be entitled to a transfer of the domain name; the complainant shall prove the following three elements:

- (i) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights;
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
- (iii) the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Based on the above regulations under the Policy, what the Panel needs to do is to find out whether each and all of the above-mentioned elements are established. If all three elements are established, the Panel will make a decision in favor of the Complainant. If the three elements are not established, the claims by the Complainant shall be rejected.

The Respondents did not submit a Response of any argument against what the Complainant claimed and to show their intentions to retain the disputed domain names as required by the Policy and the Rules. If the Respondents do not submit a response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute based upon the complaint. In view of the situation, the Panel cannot help but make the decision based primarily upon the contentions and the accompanying exhibits by the Complainant, except where there is an exhibit proving to the contrary.

I. Identity or Confusing Similarity

Pursuant to Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, a complainant must prove that the domain name is identical with or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights.

A. Complainant has rights in a trademark or service mark

The Complainant has provided evidence of ownership of valid trademark registrations for the trademark “10 CORSO COMO”, registered in 2009 in numerous jurisdictions and classes as mentioned above in the IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS. The trademarks are still valid and their registration dates significantly predate the registration dates of the disputed domain names, i.e. July 2, 2026 and July 23, 2026. The Complainant therefore has rights in the trademark “10 CORSO COMO”.

B. The disputed domain names should be identical or confusingly similar to the trademark or service mark

The disputed domain names contain the Complainant's trademark “10 CORSO COMO” in its entirety with addition of hyphen “-”. WIPO Overview 3.1, paragraph 1.8 mentions: “Where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element”. Paragraph 1.7 mentions: “In cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark”.

As to the generic Top Level Domain “.com”, it is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such can be disregarded for the purpose of assessing identity or confusing similarity.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights according to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. Accordingly, the Complainant has proven that the first element required by paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is established.

II. Rights or Legitimate Interests of the Respondents

The Complainant contends that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names on the grounds: i) the Respondents are not its authorized dealers, agents, distributors or resellers. The Respondents are not authorized to register and use its trademark in a domain name; ii) the Respondents failed to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names;

Once the Complainant makes out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. If the Respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. See WIPO Overview 3.1, paragraph 2.1.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy lists a number of circumstances which can be taken to demonstrate a respondent's rights or legitimate interests in a domain name. However, the Respondents have failed to meet that burden. The Respondents did not submit any evidence to demonstrate any of the above circumstances.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the Complainant has proven that the second element required by paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is established.

III. Bad Faith

Under Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith on the following grounds:

A. The disputed domain names have been registered in bad faith

The Panel finds that the Respondents had knowledge of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain names, considering the following circumstances:

WIPO Overview 3.1, paragraph 3.2.2 mentions: "Noting the near instantaneous and global reach of the Internet and search engines and particularly in circumstances where the complainant's mark is widely known (including in its sector) or highly specific and a respondent cannot credibly claim to have been unaware of the mark (particularly in the case of domainers), panels have been prepared to infer that the respondent knew, or have found that the respondent should have known, that its registration would be identical or confusingly similar to a complainant's mark".

The Panel believes that before registration of the disputed domain names, the Respondents had made searches for the wording "10 CORSO COMO" and knew it was the trademark of the Complainant. This can be proved by the "About Us" section, which clearly refers to the Complainant's first iconic shop located in Milan under the brand "10CORSOCOMO". Moreover, the websites both promote and sell "10CORSOCOMO" alleged products.

In view of the above circumstances, the Panel holds that the Respondents had knowledge of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain names. As the domain names would cause confusion to internet users, they should have avoided the registration, which is considered good faith, but they registered the disputed domain names. The Respondents deliberately sought to cause such confusion. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names have been registered in bad faith.

B. The disputed domain names are being used in bad faith

Paragraph 4(b) (iv) of the Policy states that the following circumstance in particular shall be evidence of registration and use of a domain name in bad faith: By using the domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or location or of a product or service on its website or location.

According to the above paragraph 4(b) (iv) of the Policy, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are being used in bad faith. The Panel supports the Complainant's contention, based on the following factors:

Both disputed domain names resolve to websites that sell a wide range of products including apparel, fragrances, bags, shoes, accessories. The "About Us" section contains numerous references to the Complainant's iconic shop in Milan and to the "10CORSOCOMO" brand. The websites both promote and sell "10CORSOCOMO" alleged products. The websites create the impression of being part of the Complainant's official network.

The Respondents exploit the Complainant's trademark to generate traffic. By using the disputed domain names in this manner, the Respondents are intentionally attempting to attract Internet users to their websites for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website.

Considering the above factors, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names are being used in bad faith.

Regarding the Complainant's contention on bad faith, the Respondents should rebut it, but they did not make any response, which strengthened the Panel's findings on its bad faith.

In view of all the above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith according to paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. Therefore, the Complainant has proven that the third element required by paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is established.

Decision

For all the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy and Rule 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain names be transferred to the Complainant.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

- 1. 10-corsocomo.com: Transferred
- 2. corsocomo-10.com: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name Yunze Lian

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-10-14

Publish the Decision