

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

**Klarna Bank AB v. Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot / Waseem Sadiq
Case No. D2022-0996**

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Klarna Bank AB, Sweden, represented by SILKA AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot, United States of America / Waseem Sadiq, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <klarnaplugin.com> and <klarnaplugins.com> are registered with Dynadot, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 23, 2022. On March 24, 2022, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On March 25, 2022, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 25, 2022 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 amendment to the Complaint on March 25, 2022.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 March 28, 2022. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 17, 2022. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 19, 2022.

The Center appointed Alexandre Nappey as the sole panelist in this matter on April 25, 2022. 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

Founded in 2005 in Stockholm, Sweden, the Complainant is currently one of the largest banks in Europe, providing payment solutions and e-commerce payment services for online storefronts. The Complainant owns valid and subsisting registrations for the KLARNA trademark in numerous regions and countries, including in the European Union, with the earliest registration dating back to December 6, 2010.

Among others, the Complainant owns the following:

Trademark	Reg. No.	Territory	Date of Registration
KLARNA	1217315	International registration (designating, <i>inter alia</i> , Australia, Japan, Singapore, and United States of America)	March 4, 2014
KLARNA. (Figurative)	1530491	International registration (designating, <i>inter alia</i> , Norway, Switzerland, and United Kingdom)	January 30, 2020
KLARNA	1066079	International registration (designating, <i>inter alia</i> , China, Norway, and Türkiye)	December 21, 2010
KLARNA	009199803	European Union	December 6, 2010

The Respondent registered the disputed domain names on January 10, 2022. At the time of filing of this Complaint, the disputed domain names resolved to similar pay-per-click parking pages.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant asserts ownership of the KLARNA trademark and has adduced evidence of trademark registrations in numerous regions and countries around the world including in the United States of America and the European Union. The Complainant's trademarks were registered as early as December 6, 2010. The disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's KLARNA trademark, according to the Complainant, because they incorporate the Complainant's KLARNA trademark coupled with the generic terms "plugin" and "plugins".

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names based on: the distinctiveness of the KLARNA trademark exclusively associated with the Complainant; the lack of any authorization, license, permission, or relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent; the Respondent's use of the disputed domain names to divert Internet users to pay-per-click advertisements for third party services and websites.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith for numerous reasons, including: the Respondent's use of the disputed domain names to divert Internet users to pay-per-click advertisements for third party services and websites, and thereby generate "click through" revenue and the Respondent's failure to reply to the Complainant's cease and desist correspondence.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant has the burden of proving the following:

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

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complaint shows trademark registrations for KLARNA obtained by the Complainant as early as in 2010. The disputed domain names differ from the Complainant's trademark KLARNA by the addition of the suffix "plugin" in singular and plural respectively, as well as the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com".

Previous UDRP panels have found that the mere addition of a term to a trademark in a domain name does not avoid a finding of confusing similarity. This has been held in many UDRP cases (see, e.g., *The British Broadcasting Corporation v. Jaime Renteria*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0050](#); *Volvo Trademark Holding AB v. SC-RAD Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0601](#); *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Lars Stork*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0628](#); *America Online, Inc. v. Dolphin@Heart*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0713](#); *AltaVista Company v. S. M. A., Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0927](#)).

It is also already well established that the addition of a gTLD such as ".com" is typically irrelevant when determining whether a domain name is confusingly similar to a complainant's trademark.

As a result, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks, and that the Complainant has satisfied the first element of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Respondent has not submitted a response to the Complaint.

There is no evidence that the Respondent has any authorization to use the Complainant's trademark or to register any domain names containing the trademark KLARNA.

There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names.

There is no evidence that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names or that before any notice of the dispute, the Respondent has made use of, or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain names or a name corresponding to the disputed domain names in connection with a *bona fide* offering of goods or services.

Instead, there is evidence in the Complaint that the disputed domain names were registered with the intention of commercial gain because both of them resolve to similar websites with pay-per-click links.

For the above reasons, the Panel finds that the condition of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy has been satisfied, *i.e.*, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The trademark KLARNA is registered by the Complainant in several jurisdictions and the above-mentioned trademark registrations owned by the Complainant under section 4 predate the registration of the disputed domain names.

The disputed domain names reproduce the Complainant's trademark KLARNA in its entirety with the addition of the term "plugin" or "plugins". The Complainant's KLARNA mark is known by the consumers and has a strong online visibility. Thus, the fact that the disputed domain names comprise such a mark associated with the expressions "plugin" and "plugins" can by itself create a presumption of the Respondent's bad faith, as it is very unlikely that the Respondent did not know the Complainant's marks on the occasion of the registration of the disputed domain names, and the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. See section 3.1.4 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)").

Taking also into account that the disputed domain names are being used as a parked page with pay-per-click links, some of which appears to be related to the Complainant's business, as per the evidence showed in the Complaint, this Panel finds under the circumstances that the Respondent has intentionally targeted the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain names for commercial gain.

For the above reasons, the Panel finds that the condition of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy has been satisfied, *i.e.*, the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

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 names, <klarnaplugin.com> and <klarnaplugins.com>, be transferred to the Complainant.

/Alexandre Nappey/

Alexandre Nappey

Sole Panelist

Date: June 24, 2022