

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-102247

Case number	CAC-UDRP-102247
Time of filing	2018-12-04 10:06:16
Domain names	INTESASONPAOLO.COM

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Intesa Sanpaolo S.p.A.
--------------	-------------------------------

Complainant representative

Organization	Perani Pozzi Associati
--------------	-------------------------------

Respondent

Organization	Cyber Operations Team
--------------	------------------------------

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings pending or decided which relate to the disputed domain name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The reputation of the Complainant's trademarks and domain names is self-evident and proved by:

- Complainant's trademarks:

The Complainant is the owner, among others, of the following registrations for the trademark "INTESA SANPAOLO":

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

EU trademark registration n. 5301999 "INTESA SANPAOLO", applied on September 8, 2006, granted on June 18, 2007 and duly renewed, in classes 35, 36 and 38;

EU trademark registration n. 5421177 "INTESA SANPAOLO & device", applied on October 27, 2006, granted on November 5, 2007 and duly renewed, in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 38, 41 and 42.

- Complainant's domain names:

Moreover, the Complainant is also the owner, among the others, of the following domain names bearing the sign "INTESA SANPAOLO": "INTESASANPAOLO.COM, .ORG, .EU, .INFO, .NET, .BIZ" and INTESA-SANPAOLO.COM, .ORG, .EU, .INFO, .NET, .BIZ". All of them are now connected to the official website www.intesasanpaolo.com.

Furthermore Complainant's trademarks are extensively registered around the world.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

FACTS ASSERTED BY THE COMPLAINANT AND NOT CONTESTED BY THE RESPONDENT:

THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME IS IDENTICAL OR CONFUSINGLY SIMILAR TO A TRADEMARK OR SERVICE MARK IN WHICH THE COMPLAINANT HAS RIGHTS

The Complainant is the leading Italian banking group and also one of the protagonists in the European financial arena. Intesa Sanpaolo is the company resulting from the merger (effective as of January 1, 2007) between Banca Intesa S.p.A. and Sanpaolo IMI S.p.A., two of the top Italian banking groups.

Intesa Sanpaolo is among the top banking groups in the euro zone, with a market capitalisation exceeding 34,2 billion euro, and the undisputed leader in Italy, in all business areas (retail, corporate and wealth management). Thanks to a network of approximately 4,400 branches capillary and well distributed throughout the Country, with market shares of more than 16% in most Italian regions, the Group offers its services to approximately 11.9 million customers. Intesa Sanpaolo has a strong presence in Central-Eastern Europe with a network of approximately 1.000 branches and over 7,5 million customers. Moreover, the international network specialised in supporting corporate customers is present in 25 countries, in particular in the Mediterranean area and those areas where Italian companies are most active, such as the United States, Russia, China and India.

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 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).

This is thus a clear case of "typosquatting", i.e. the disputed domain name contains an obvious misspelling of the Complainant's trademark; INTESASONPAOLO instead of INTESA SANPAOLO.

Previous panels have found that the slight spelling variations does not prevent a disputed domain name from being confusing similar to the complainant's trademark.

Simple exchange of letters is not a sufficient element to escape the finding that the domain name is confusingly similar to the complainant's trademarks and domain names.

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).

The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not affiliated with him nor authorized by him in any way to use his trademarks in a domain name or on a website. The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent.

Neither licence nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Complainant's trademark INTESASANPAOLO, or apply for registration of the disputed domain name by the Complainant.

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).

Given the distinctiveness of the trademark and the content of the website, it is clear that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark.

In addition, the disputed domain name is not used for any bone fide offerings. More particularly, there are present circumstances indicating that the Respondent has registered or acquired the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the disputed domain name registration to the Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name (par. 4(b)(i) of the Policy).

All these elements lead to the conclusion that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to the Respondent's website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of such websites.

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 three essential issues under the paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are whether:

- i. the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- ii. the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name; and
- iii. the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

2. The Panel reviewed carefully all documents provided by the Complainant. The Respondent did not provide the Panel with any documents or statements. The Panel also visited all available websites and public information concerning the disputed domain name, namely the WHOIS databases.

3. The UDRP Rules clearly say in its Article 3 that any person or entity may initiate an administrative proceeding by submitting a complaint in accordance with the Policy and these Rules.

4. The Panel therefore came to the following conclusions:

a) The Complainant has clearly proven that it is a long standing and successful company in the financial services business. It is clear that its trademark and domain name "INTESASANPAOLO" are well-known.

The Complainant states and proves that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademarks and its domain names. Indeed, the trademark is partially incorporated in the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name is therefore deemed identical or confusingly similar.

b) It has to be stressed that it was proven that there are no fair rights of the Respondent to the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not generally known by the disputed domain name and have not acquired any trademark or service mark rights in the name or mark.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interest with respect to the disputed domain name.

c) The disputed domain name was registered with an intention to attract customers of another well-known domain name/registered trademark holder. Therefore there cannot be found any legitimate interest of the Respondent.

It is clear that the Complainant's trademarks and website(s) were used by the Complainant long time before the disputed domain name was registered and used. It is therefore concluded that the disputed domain name was registered with an intention to attract customers of another well-known domain name/registered trademark holder.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

For the reasons stated above, it is the decision of this Panel that the Complainant has satisfied all three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **INTESASONPAOLO.COM**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Dr. Vít Horáček
------	------------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION	2019-01-13
------------------------	------------

Publish the Decision
