

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Alfa Laval Corporate AB v. Tran Dang Tu
Case No. D2025-3496

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Alfa Laval Corporate AB, Sweden, represented by Advokatbyrå Gulliksson AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Tran Dang Tu, Viet Nam.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <alfalaval-vn.com> is registered with Mat Bao Corporation (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 28, 2025. On August 29, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 30, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

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 September 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 30, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 2, 2025.

The Center appointed Mario Soerensen Garcia as the sole panelist in this matter on October 15, 2025. 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 Swedish company, founded in 1883 and is a global provider of products in the areas of heat transfer, separation and gas and fluid handling.

The Complainant owns trademarks consisting of ALFA LAVAL, including but not limited to:

Jurisdiction	Reg No.	Trademark	Reg. Date	Classes
United States	2809696	ALFA LAVAL (stylized)	February 3, 2004	1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 37
United States	0764251	ALFA LAVAL	February 4, 1964	6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 16, 21, 28
United States	1163281	ALFA LAVAL	August 4, 1981	3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 21

The Complainant also owns the domain name <alfalaval.com>, registered on May 12, 1997.

The Respondent is Tran Dang Tu, from Viet Nam.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 9, 2021, and resolves to an inactive page. However, at the time of the submission of the Complaint, the website was used to display content originally provided by the Complainant and stated that the Respondent was the official importer and distributor of Alfa Laval products for industrial and microbiological applications in Viet Nam, as evidenced by the Complainant (Annexes 3 and 4 to the Complaint).

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.

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark ALFA LAVAL.

The Complainant submits that there is no evidence that the Respondent has made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name for legitimate purposes, nor is there any evidence that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in connection with any noncommercial or fair use. The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

That being the case, the Complainant finds that the disputed domain name is likely to make Internet users assume that the disputed domain name offers services supplied by the Complainant, in particular by imitating its trademark and offering goods and services allegedly authorized by the Complainant.

According to the Complainant, it has prior rights over the trademark ALFA LAVAL and has not authorized the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant's intellectual property rights for the ALFA LAVAL trademarks and domain name predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant argues that the registration and use of the disputed domain name have been conducted in bad faith.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements is satisfied:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (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 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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 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 website at the disputed domain name reproduced the Complainant's trademark and website content. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here claimed as applicable to this case as impersonation/passing off and selling counterfeit goods/services, or other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Furthermore, the nature of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

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 finds that the Respondent was clearly aware of the ALFA LAVAL mark, as the website under the disputed domain name displayed the Complainant's trademark and goods and claimed to be the official distributor of the Complainant's products, intentionally attempting to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

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 held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here, claimed as impersonation/passing off and selling of counterfeit goods, or other types of fraud, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes 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 <alfalaval-vn.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mario Soerensen Garcia/

Mario Soerensen Garcia

Sole Panelist

Date: October 29, 2025