

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

**GRENDENE S.A v. Global Internet Telemetry Measurement Collective, LLC,
GITMC**

Case No. D2024-1668

1. The Parties

The Complainant is GRENDENE S.A, Brazil, represented by Silveiro Advogados, Brazil.

The Respondent is Global Internet Telemetry Measurement Collective, LLC, GITMC, United States of America (“US”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ad-grendene.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 19, 2024. On April 22 and 30, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 30, 2024, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Super Privacy Service Ltd c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 1, 8 and 14, 2024, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint.

The Center verified that the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 15, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 4, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 5, 2024.

The Center appointed Pablo A. Palazzi as the sole panelist in this matter on June 12, 2024. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a Brazilian company founded in 1971 with a prestigious reputation and known among consumers, with global presence in over 80 countries and with more than 3,000 points of sales. The Complainant has around 20,000 employees and 11 factories with aggregate capacity to produce up to 250 million pairs of shoes per year, offering an assortment of footwear products that meet the needs of women, men, and children in more than 100 countries. In 2019 alone, the Complainant sold 150.8 million pairs of footwear product.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark with the term GRENDENE, to mention only one: trademark registered in Brazil (Reg. N. 790351854), filed on November 29, 1979, registered on August 31, 1982, and timely renewed, for class 25.

The Complainant is the owner of several domain names including the GRENDENE trademark such as <grendenekids.com.br>, <grendene.com.br>, <clubegrendene.com.br> and <lojagrendene.com.br>.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 5, 2019. The disputed domain name is not in use.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

According to the Complainant, each of the three elements specified in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied in the present case.

First, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the mark registrations of the Complainant.

Second, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has neither rights nor legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Third, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements which a complainant must satisfy in order to succeed. The Complainant must satisfy that:

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

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms like the word "ad" and a hyphen ("-") may bear on assessment of the second or third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of "proving a negative", requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a 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 domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The disputed domain name has no affiliation whatsoever with Grendene or any of its resellers or distributors. Grendene has not concluded any agreements nor granted any licenses related to the registration and use of this disputed domain name.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that:

- the Complainant was founded in 1971 and has been using the trademark for several decades;
- the name “Grendene” has no dictionary meaning in any language: the expression is the family name of the founders of the Complainant’s company;
- the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in 2019;
- the disputed domain name is not in use;
- The Respondent has failed to submit a response.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the non-use of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this proceeding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <ad-grendene.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Pablo A. Palazzi/

Pablo A. Palazzi

Sole Panelist

Date: June 26, 2024