

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Verisure Sàrl v. Ivano Pezzoli, Pezzoli Ivano  
Case No. D2024-4067

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Verisure Sàrl, Switzerland, represented by Abion GmbH, Switzerland.

The Respondent is Ivano Pezzoli, Pezzoli Ivano, Italy.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <verisure-store.com> is registered with Tucows Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 3, 2024. On October 3, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 3, 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 (Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0172170737) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 4, 2024, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on October 9, 2024.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended 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 October 10, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 30, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 31, 2024.

The Center appointed George R. F. Souter as the sole panelist in this matter on November 6, 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, a Swiss company, is a leading provider of professionally monitored security systems, with 24/7 response services, having more than five million customers in 17 countries, and employing more than 28,000 people across the world.

The Complainant trades under its VERISURE trademark, and has registered its mark widely internationally, including European Union trademark, registration number 006674915, registered on March 26, 2010.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 22, 2024, and resolves to a website replicating the Complainant's Italian website (at <verisure.it>).

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark, that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and that the Complainant has never granted permission to the Respondent to use its VERISURE trademark in connection with the registration of a domain name, or otherwise. Furthermore, the Complainant argues 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**

##### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Complainant's trademark 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.

The mere addition of "-store" following the Complainant's VERISURE trademark in the disputed domain name does not detract from this finding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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

## **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

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

## **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was deliberately registered to target the Complainant with the intent to mislead Internet users into believing that the website linked to the disputed domain name either belongs to the Complainant or is connected to it, which is a clear case of registration in bad faith, as the Panel so finds.

It is well-established in prior decisions under the Policy that the use of a disputed domain name found to be confusingly similar to a complainant's trademark in connection with a copycat website constitutes use of the disputed domain name in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. This is clearly the situation in the circumstances of the present case, and the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith.

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 <verisure-store.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/George R F Souter/*

**George R F Souter**

Sole Panelist

Date: November 20, 2024