

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

AAK AB (publ) v. sebastien greg, aak
Case No. D2026-2183

1. The Parties

The Complainant is AAK AB (publ), Sweden, represented by Abion AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is sebastien greg, aak, Netherlands (Kingdom of the) ("the Netherlands").

2. Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <aakdistributionbv.com> is registered with Key-Systems GmbH (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 20, 2026. On May 21, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 26, 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 (OWNER c/o whoisproxy.com) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 26, 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 June 2, 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 June 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 28, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Gareth Dickson as the sole panelist in this matter on July 13, 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 AAKAB (publ), a Swedish company established in 2004 following the merger of Aarhus United and Karlshamns AB, whose respective businesses in the production of vegetable oils and fats date back to 1871 and 1918 respectively. The Complainant is a manufacturer and supplier of plant-based oils and fats for the food, confectionery, bakery, dairy, pharmaceutical, cosmetics, and animal nutrition industries. The Complainant is listed on Nasdaq Stockholm, employs approximately 4,100 people, and operates through more than 25 regional sales offices and over 20 production facilities worldwide, serving customers in more than 150 countries. The Complainant operates in the United States of America (“United States”) as AAK USA Inc., and has subsidiaries in the Netherlands operating as AAK Netherlands BV and AAK Rotterdam BV.

The Complainant owns registered trade marks for AAK (the “Mark”), including, in chronological order:

- International trade mark registration No. 900433 for AAK, designating inter alia Australia, the European Union, Japan, and the United States (registered in 2006);
- Swedish trade mark registration No. 393500 for AAK (registered in 2008);
- United States trade mark registration No. 3409316 for AAK (registered in 2008); and
- European Union trade mark registration No. 018049544 for AAK (registered in 2019).

The Complainant also owns a number of domain names incorporating the Mark, including <aak.com>, <aak-foods.com>, <aak.eu>, and <aak.info>.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 12, 2022. On October 14, 2025, the Complainant found that the disputed domain name resolved to an active website presenting itself as “AAK Netherlands BV” – the name of the Complainant’s Dutch subsidiary – and displaying the Mark and the Complainant’s logo, the address of that subsidiary, and the names of individuals who are employees of the Complainant. The website described itself as an international wholesale supplier and distributor and included sections such as “About Us”, “Company Profile”, “Quality Assurance”, “Testimonials”, and “Contact Us”. On October 14 and October 15, 2025, respectively, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Registrar and to the Respondent. No response was received. By the time the Complaint, and later the amended Complaint, were filed, the website had changed to a holding page stating “Pardon our dust! We’re working on something amazing — check back soon!”, while continuing to display the name “AAK Netherlands BV”. The disputed domain name has active MX records.

The disputed domain name was initially registered in the name of a privacy service. Following the Center’s request for registrar verification, the Registrar disclosed the underlying registrant as Sebastien Greg, with the organization field recorded as “aak”, an address in the Netherlands, and a Gmail email address. The Complainant thereafter amended the Complaint to name the disclosed registrant as the Respondent. The Respondent has not submitted a Response in this proceeding.

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 wholly incorporates the Mark together with descriptive terms referencing the Complainant’s business and its Dutch subsidiary; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, including because the website to which it resolved was used to impersonate the Complainant’s genuine Dutch subsidiary, AAK Netherlands BV, using the Mark and the Complainant’s logo, that subsidiary’s address, and the names of individuals employed by the Complainant; and that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith, including because the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating

a likelihood of confusion with the Mark, and because the registrant details disclosed by the Registrar were designed to create a false impression of association with the Complainant.

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 trade mark 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 shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Mark 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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms – here, "distribution" and "bv" – may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 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.

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 – here, operating a website that passed off the Complainant's genuine Dutch subsidiary – can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that adopted the name, logo, and Dutch subsidiary address of the Complainant, and referred to individuals employed by the Complainant, thereby intentionally attempting to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of that website, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Furthermore, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity – here, operating a website that passed off the Complainant's genuine Dutch subsidiary – constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 notes that the disputed domain name has more recently been set to display a holding page rather than the more detailed passing off site first found by the Complainant. This change does not change the outcome of these proceedings. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trade mark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of 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 <aakdistributionbv.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gareth Dickson/

Gareth Dickson

Sole Panelist

Date: July 27, 2026