

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson v. guoshao pu, guoshao pu
Case No. D2025-0241

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson, Sweden, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is guoshao pu, guoshao pu, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <erics-son.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 22, 2025. On January 22, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 23, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 24, 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 amended Complaint on January 28, 2025.

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 February 3, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 23, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 28, 2025.

The Center appointed Pablo A. Palazzi as the sole panelist in this matter on March 10, 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 the company Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson headquartered in Stockholm, Sweden, a globally recognized leader in the field of communication technology and services.

Founded in 1876, the Complainant has played a pivotal role in the evolution of the telecommunications industry by contributing numerous innovations. The Complainant is listed on Nasdaq Stockholm and on NASDAQ in New York and employs over 103,000 employees worldwide, across six continents.

The Complainant owns several trademarks around the world, namely:

- United Kingdom trademark ERICSSON no. UK00900107003 registered on March 23, 1999, covering goods and services in classes 9, 11, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, and 42.
- United Kingdom trademark ERICSSON no. UK00901459130 registered on February 15, 2001, covering goods and services in classes 9, 11, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 41, and 42.
- United Kingdom trademark ERICSSON no. UK00905151006 registered on May 24, 2007, covering services in classes 41 and 42.
- United States of America trademark ERICSSON no. 1313196 registered on January 8, 1985, covering goods in classes 9 and 16.
- European Union trademark ERICSSON no. 000107003 registered on March 23, 1999, covering goods and services in classes 9, 11, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, and 42.
- European Union trademark ERICSSON no. 004822219 registered on December 7, 2006, covering services in classes 41 and 42.

Furthermore, the Complainant is the owner of the domain name <ericsson.com> registered since July 25, 1989, and used as its primary domain name.

The disputed domain name <erics-son.com> was registered on August 3, 2024, and resolves to a blank page.

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.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which a complainant must satisfy in order to succeed. The Complainant must satisfy that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a 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 being 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 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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms like a hyphen ("-") between the middle of the trademark 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.

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 Complainant has been using the trademark for several decades.
- The Complainant trademark ERICSSON is well-known (See, e.g. *Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson v. Andrea Mariotti*, WIPO Case No. [DRO2010-0008](#); *Telefonaktiebolaget L M Ericsson v. Dailey Wells Comm*, WIPO Case No. [DCC2006-0005](#); *Sony Ericsson Mobile Communication AB, Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson, Sony Corporation v. Netfreetz*, WIPO Case No. [DTV2007-0001](#)).
- the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant mark in its entirety with the addition of a hyphen ("-").
- The Respondent registered the disputed domain name only in 2024.
- The Respondent has not contested any of the allegations made by the Complainant.
- The disputed domain name is not active.

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 found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the non-use of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this proceeding. Although panelists will look at the totality of the circumstances in each case, factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, and (iii) the respondent's concealing its identity or use of false contact details (noted to be in breach of its registration agreement). [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the 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 <erics-son.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Pablo A. Palazzi/

Pablo A. Palazzi

Sole Panelist

Date: March 24, 2025