

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Archer-Daniels-Midland Company v. Noble Broker
Case No. D2025-5214

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Archer-Daniels-Midland Company, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Innis Law Group LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Noble Broker, Canada.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <noevia-group.com> is registered with Name SRS AB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 13, 2025. On December 15, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 16, 2025, 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 (unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 16, 2025, 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 December 16, 2025.

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 December 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 7, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Gareth Dickson as the sole panelist in this matter on January 21, 2026. 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 Archer-Daniels-Midland Company, a corporation founded in 1902 and headquartered in Decatur, Illinois, United States. In 2019, the Complainant acquired Neovia, including its trade mark interests in NEOVIA (the "Mark").

The Complaint is based on registered trade mark rights said to be owned by the Complainant or Neovia. The relevant asserted registered trade marks are:

- International Trade Mark Registration No. 983251 for the word mark NEOVIA, registered on October 15, 2008; and
- French Trade Mark Registration No. 4242534 for the word mark NEOVIA GROUP, registered on January 21, 2016.

The Complainant states that it and /or Neovia have used the Mark extensively and continuously in commerce for many years and that the Mark has acquired goodwill and reputation in connection with animal nutrition products and services worldwide.

The Complainant also operates a number of domain names incorporating the Mark, including <neovia-group.com>, which redirects to the Complainant's animal nutrition website.

The disputed domain name <noevia-group.com> was registered on August 25, 2025. At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name did not resolve to an active website but appears to have been used in connection with email addresses as part of an alleged fraudulent scheme.

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 the Mark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant submits that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Mark and used it as part of an impersonation and fraud scheme designed to mislead third parties and divert payments.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 Panel finds that 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 Mark is recognisable within the disputed domain name, which reproduces the Mark entirely save for rotating the "o" and "e" to form what is likely to be a common misspelling of the Mark. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7, and section 1.9.

Although the addition of other terms, here "-group", may bear on assessment of the second and 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity or illegal activity, here claimed to be the fraudulent impersonation of a business (and individual) within the Complainant's group following the surreptitious interception of emails which are clearly commercially sensitive and equally clearly not intended for the Respondent, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name shortly before using it in email communications that impersonated an employee of the Complainant's subsidiary and sought to mislead a third party, through the interception of sensitive emails, into changing banking details and redirecting payments.

Panels have also held that the use of a domain name for the sort of illegitimate activity and illegal activity of the Respondent described in section 6.B above 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.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the evidence filed by the Complainant showing that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name for fraudulent email purposes. The Panel notes such email activity, together with the seemingly inherent distinctiveness of the Mark and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the disputed domain name was registered and 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 <noevia-group.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gareth Dickson/

Gareth Dickson

Sole Panelist

Date: February 4, 2026