

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Apoteket AB v. Ilgam Nurtdinov
Case No. D2026-0725

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Apoteket AB, Sweden, represented by AWA Sweden AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Ilgam Nurtdinov, Russian Federation.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <snabbapoteket.com> is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 20, 2026. On February 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 21, 2026, 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 (“Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 3, 2026, 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 February 27, 2026.

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 March 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 22, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 25, 2026.

The Center appointed Steven A. Maier as the sole panelist in this matter on March 31, 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 a state-owned company registered in Sweden. It was formed in 1970, and operated a monopoly over pharmacies located in Sweden, comprising approximately 900 stores, until the deregulation of those services in 2009.

The Complainant is the owner of various registrations for the trademark APOTEKET, including for example:

- European Union trademark registration number 005131875 for a figurative mark comprising the name APOTEKET and a logo, registered on January 30, 2008; and

- European Union trademark registration number 008580508 for a figurative mark comprising the name APOTEKET and a logo, registered on June 8, 2010.

The Complainant operates a website at “www.apoteket.se”.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 16, 2025.

On September 24, 2025, the disputed domain name resolved to a Swedish language website, offering various medications for sale online. The website also included what appeared to be pay-per-click (“PPC”) links to “Online Pharmacy Medication”, “Purchase Pharmaceuticals Online” and similar offerings.

At the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name does not appear to resolve to any active website.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant submits that its APOTEKET trademark is widely recognized in Sweden as indicating the Complainant. It states that it remains Sweden’s largest operator of physical pharmacies, with 400 stores, including 70 in Stockholm alone. It provides evidence of substantial historical sales revenues, and of recognition as a highly ranked and trusted brand within the Nordic countries.

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 submits that the disputed domain name wholly incorporates its APOTEKET trademark, and that the addition of term “snabb”, which translates from Swedish as “quick” or “swift”, does not prevent it from being confusingly similar to that trademark.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. It submits that the disputed domain name is misleading in itself, as suggesting to Internet users that it represents a quick method of obtaining the Complainant’s products. The Complainant states that, in fact, the Respondent’s website has offered illegal drugs, which should be available on prescription only, without requiring any prescription, and that it has also offered PPC links to competitors of the Complainant.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It states that its APOTEKET trademark has been widely known in Sweden for many years, and that the Respondent selected it in order to misrepresent to Internet users that its website offered the Complainant's goods instantly. It notes in particular that the Respondent's website was operated in the Swedish language, thereby targeting the Complainant's primary area of operations. The Complainant adds that the Respondent's use of the website to offer illegal drugs is damaging to the Complainant's reputation.

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 order to succeed in the Complaint, the Complainant is required to show that all three of the elements set out under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are present. Those elements are 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 under the Policy 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 Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has established that it is the owner of registered trademark rights in the figurative mark APOTEKET. The disputed domain name wholly incorporates that mark, preceded by the term "snabb", meaning "quick" or "fast". The addition of a dictionary term of this nature does not prevent the Complainant's mark from being recognizable within the disputed domain name, and the Panel finds therefore that the first element under the Policy is 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 that 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 3.1](#), section 2.1.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case for the purposes of the second element. The Panel accepts the Complainant's submission, which the Respondent has not disputed, that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in order to offer prescription drugs without a prescription, and therefore unlawfully. It is well established in prior decisions under the UDRP that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, including the unlawful supply of pharmaceuticals, can never confer rights or legitimate interests upon a respondent (see e.g. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1). The Panel finds, moreover, that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to target the Complainant's trademark rights, rather than legitimately in connection with any arguable dictionary meaning of the disputed domain name (see further below). Again, the targeting of third party trademark rights cannot confer rights or legitimate interests upon a respondent.

The Panel therefore finds that the second element under the Policy is established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that the Swedish word "apoteket" translates in English as "the pharmacy", which represents a dictionary or descriptive term. The combination of the terms "apoteket" and "snabb", meaning "fast" or "quick", thereby arguably results in a combination of dictionary words, describing pharmaceutical services that are quickly or readily available.

As observed in [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1:

"... generally speaking, panels have accepted that aggregating and holding domain names (usually for resale) consisting e.g., of acronyms, dictionary words, common phrases, or unique/catchy or memorable terms (alone or in combination) can be bona fide and is not per se illegitimate under the UDRP where the respondent can show that the purpose of the registration was not to target a trademark."

The Panel must therefore determine in this case, on the balance of probabilities, whether the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with a view to legitimate commercial use, in connection with its dictionary meaning and independently of the Complainant's trademark, or alternatively to target the Complainant's trademark rights (and to that extent, similar considerations inform both the second and third elements under the Policy).

The Panel finds it to be highly significant in this case that, while the Complainant's trademark APOTEKET may comprise a dictionary or descriptive term, that mark undoubtedly has special status in Sweden, where it has been recognized by the public for many decades as representing the Complainant, initially as the state-appointed provider of all pharmacy services, and subsequently as a major operator of physical pharmacy stores. The Panel also notes that the Complainant operates <apoteket.se>, and that the Complainant submitted evidence of its recognition as a highly ranked and trusted brand within the Nordic countries. Both the disputed domain name and the Respondent's website are clearly aimed at the Swedish public, since the disputed domain name is comprised of Swedish terms, and the Respondent's website is provided in the Swedish language. The Panel also notes that a Google search of the term APOTEKET shows the Complainant's figurative trademark as the first suggested result: [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8.

Furthermore, in addition to offering pharmaceuticals on an unlawful basis, the Respondent's website appears to have included PPC links to competitors of the Complainant.

In those circumstances, noting the absence of a response and particularly the illegal nature of the conduct on the related website (leading to a finding of lack of rights or legitimate interests), the Panel finds it sufficiently to be inferred that the Respondent likely registered and has used the disputed domain name in order to target the Complainant's trademark rights (rather than for a good faith use of the terms comprising the domain name for their descriptive qualities) and that, by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or of a product or service on its website (paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy).

The third element under the Policy is therefore established.

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 <snabbapoteket.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Steven A. Maier/

Steven A. Maier

Sole Panelist

Date: April 14, 2026