Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-109080

Case number	CAC-UDRP-109080
Time of filing	2026-10-16 09:39:05
Domain names	INTESASANPAOLOCASINO.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	Lukas Hoffmann

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 proved to be the owner of the following trademark registrations:

- International trademark registration n. 920896 “INTESA SANPAOLO”, granted on March 7, 2007 and duly renewed, in connection with classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 38, 41 and 42;

- International trademark registration n. 793367 “INTESA”, granted on September 4, 2002 and duly renewed, in connection with class 36;

- EU trademark registration n. 5301999 “INTESA SANPAOLO”, filed on September 8, 2006, granted on June 18, 2007 and duly renewed, in connection with the classes 35, 36 and 38;

- EU trademark registration n. 12247979 “INTESA”, filed on October 23, 2013 and granted on March 5, 2014, in connection with classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 38, 41 and 42.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

I - Complainant

The Complainant is an Italian-based company active in the banking field.
The Complainant owns numerous trademarks composed of "INTESA" or "INTESA SAN PAOLO" and operates the domain name <intesasanpaolo.com>.

II - Respondent

The Respondent is Lukas Hoffmann, a German-based citizen.
The disputed domain name is used in connection with a gambling site.

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 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

1. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s registered trademark as it wholly incorporates the sign INTESA SAN PAOLO (see Six Continent Hotels, Inc. v. The Omnicorp, WIPO Case No. 2005–1249 and Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc., WIPO Case No. D2001-0903).

The addition of the descriptive word “CASINO" has no impact on the confusing similarity assessment since the distinctive elements INTESA SAN PAOLO are clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the addition of “.com” is generally disregarded in view of its technical function.

As a consequence, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks, for the purposes of the First Element of the Policy.

2. The Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has not submitted a response to the Complaint. Therefore, it has filed no information on possible rights or legitimate interests it might hold. On its part, the Complainant has submitted information and arguments which, according to the Panelist, are sufficient to conclude that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name.

According to the information provided by the Complainant, and not contested, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name nor has he been authorized to use the Complainant's trademark.

Moreover, the disputed domain name redirects to a gambling website. In the Panel's view, such use does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods and services nor to a non-commercial use for the purpose of the Policy.

For these reasons, the Panel takes the view that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name for the purposes of the Policy.

3. The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel finds the following circumstances as material in order to establish the Respondent's bad faith in the registration of the disputed domain name:

(i) the disputed domain name was registered well after the Complainant acquired rights on the trademarks "INTESA" and "INTESA SAN PAOLO";

(ii) the Complainant's trademark is known in the banking/financial field at least in the European Union area where the Respondent is allegedly based. The distinctiveness of the INTESA and INTESA SAN PAOLO trademarks makes it very improbable that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant's exclusive rights at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name;

(iii) the Respondent also used the figurative version of the Complainant's trademark. This proves that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's business conducted under the INTESA SAN PAOLO trademark.

The Panel agrees with the Complainant's allegations regarding the use in bad faith argument. Apparently, the disputed domain name promotes itself as, in some way, connected to the Complainant (the online gambling service launched by Intesa San Paolo). Thus, the Complainant's trademark is exploited by the Respondent, without any authorization, to provide gambling services. In the Panel's view, the disputed domain name is used to intentionally divert traffic away from the Complainant's website and to gain advantage from Complainant's activity, investments and reputation.

All the above considered, the Panel finds the evidence submitted as sufficient to prove use and registration in bad faith of the disputed domain name for the purposes of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **INTESASANPAOLOCASINO.COM**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Andrea Mascetti**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-11-20

Publish the Decision