

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson v. asdasd sadads  
Case No. D2025-1493

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is asdasd sadads, Australia.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <ericsson-support.com> is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 11, 2025. On April 14, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 15, 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 (Registrant Information Redacted) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 22, 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 April 25, 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 May 2, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 22, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 28, 2025.

The Center appointed Kiyoshi Tsuru as the sole panelist in this matter on June 3, 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 was founded in 1876 and is a leading global provider of communication technology and services around the world. The Complainant is listed on Nasdaq Stockholm and NASDAQ in New York, and employs over 103,000 people worldwide. The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations across the world, including:

Trademark	Registration No.	Jurisdiction	Date of Registration	Class
<b>ERICSSON</b>	<b>322638</b>	Australia	October 3, 1978.	Class 9.
<b>ERICSSON</b> <b>ERICSSON</b> 	<b>1313196</b>	United States of America	January 8, 1985.	Class 9, Class 16.
<b>ERICSSON</b>	<b>2665187</b>	United States of America	December 24, 2002.	Class 9, Class 11, Class 16, Class 35, Class 36, Class 37, Class 38, Class 41 and Class 42.
<b>ERICSSON</b> <b>ERICSSON</b> 	<b>2676335</b>	United States of America	January 21, 2003.	Class 9, Class 11, Class 16, Class 35, Class 36, Class 37, Class 38, Class 41 and Class 42.
<b>ERICSSON</b> <b>ERICSSON</b> 	<b>000107003</b>	European Union	March 23, 1999.	Class 9, Class 11, Class 16, Class 35, Class 36, Class 37, Class 38, Class 39, Class 41 and Class 42.

The Complainant also owns the domain name <ericsson.com> which resolves to the Complainant's official website. The Complainant's <ericsson.com> domain name was registered on July 25, 1989.

The disputed domain name <ericsson.support.com> was registered on August 8, 2024. At the time of writing this decision, said disputed domain name resolves to a website listing links to mobile applications with pornographic content.

#### 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:

#### I. Identical or Confusingly Similar

That by virtue of its trademark registrations, the Complainant is the owner of its ERICSSON trademarks (and cites WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.2.1.)

That the Top-Level Domain ".com" in the disputed domain name should not be considered when comparing the Complainant's ERICSSON trademarks and the disputed domain name (and cites [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) section 1.11.1.)

That the disputed domain name captures the Complainant's ERICSSON trademarks in their entirety, and that the addition of the generic term "support" does not negate the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's ERICSSON trademarks (and cites [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) section 1.8.)

#### II. Rights or Legitimate Interests

That the granting of registrations for its ERICSSON trademarks by the Australian, United States, and European Union trademark offices constitutes prima facie evidence of validity of said marks and of the Complainant's rights to them, including the exclusive right to use them in connection with the goods or services covered by them.

That the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, which evidences a lack of rights or legitimate interests thereto under the Policy (and cites *World Natural Bodybuilding Federation, Inc. v. Daniel Jones TheDotCafe*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-0642](#).)

That the Complainant has not licensed, authorized or permitted the Respondent to register domain names incorporating the Complainant's ERICSSON trademarks (and cites *Company S.P.A. v. Tang Hong*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-1875](#).)

That the Respondent's registration information does not resemble the disputed domain name in any way, which shows that there is no evidence establishing that the Respondent is known by the disputed domain name. That, therefore, the Respondent cannot be regarded as having acquired rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name under the Policy (and cites *Moncler S.p.A. v. Bestinfo*, WIPO Case No. [D2004-1049](#).)

That the Respondent used a privacy service, which past panels have found to equate to lack of legitimate interests (and cites *Jackson National Life Insurance Company v. Private Whols www.jacksonnationallife.com N4892*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-1855](#).)

That the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to direct Internet users to a website which features adult content, and that past panels have held that the use of a disputed domain name confusingly similar to a complainant's trademark, to link to a website featuring pornographic content evidences a lack of legitimate rights or interests (and cites *MatchNet plc v. MAC Trading*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0205](#).)

That the date of registration of the disputed domain name is significantly posterior to the filing dates, dates of first use, and dates of registration of its ERICSSON trademarks, as well as the date of registration of its <ericsson.com> domain name.

#### III. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

That the Complainant and its ERICSSON trademarks are known internationally, and that the Complainant has marketed and sold its goods and rendered its services under its ERICSSON trademarks since well before the date when the Respondent registered the disputed domain name.

That the Respondent knew or should have known of the existence of the Complainant's ERICSSON trademarks, and that registering a domain name containing well-known trademarks constitutes bad faith *per se*.

That the Complainant's fame can be demonstrated by the fact that it has been a leading global innovator in the communication technology industry for over 100 years, by considering its net sales and gross income, and because most of the results for "ericsson support" on Internet search engines are references to the Complainant and its business (and cites *Caesar World, Inc. v. Forum LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2005-0517](#)).

That the content of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves features sexually-explicit pornographic content, which fact provides evidence of the Respondent's bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name, and that past panels have held that the use of a confusingly similar domain name to direct unsuspecting Internet users to adult content constitutes evidence of bad faith registration and use (*Microsoft Corp. v. Horner*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0029](#)).

That the disputed domain name can only be taken as a vehicle for causing confusion among Internet users as to the source of the disputed domain name. That, in particular, the disputed domain name entirely comprises the Complainant's ERICSSON trademark and the related term "support", with no plausible good faith reason or logic for the Respondent to have registered the disputed domain name (and cites *OLX, B.V. Kumud, G. / Whois Agent, Whois Privacy Protection Service, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-0218](#)).

That, at the time of filing the Complaint, the Respondent employed a privacy service to hide its identity, and that past panels have held that this circumstance serves as further evidence to prove bad faith registration and use (and cites [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.6 and *Dr. Ing. H.C. F. Porsche AG v. Domains by Proxy, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0230](#)).

That the Respondent ignored the Complainant's attempts to resolve this dispute non-contentiously by sending cease and desist letters, and that past panels have held that the failure to respond to cease and desist letters may be considered a factor in finding bad faith registration and use (and cites *Encyclopedia Britannica v. Zuccarini*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0330](#) and *RRI Financial, Inc., v. Chen*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-1242](#)).

That, more likely than not, the Respondent knew and targeted the Complainant's ERICSSON trademarks, which constitutes bad faith (and cites *Tudor Games, Inc. v. Domain Hostmaster, Customer ID No. 09382953107339 dba Whois Privacy Services Pty Ltd / Domain Administrator, Vertical Axis Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-1754](#)).

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy sets out the three requirements that the Complainant must prove in order to successfully request remedies:

- (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark to which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in connection to the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Given the Respondent's default and therefore, failure to specifically address the case merits as they relate to the three UDRP elements, the Panel may decide this proceeding based on the Complainant's undisputed factual allegations under paragraphs 5(f), 14(a), and 15(a) of the Rules (see *Joseph Phelps Vineyards LLC v. NOLDC, Inc., Alternative Identity, Inc., and Kentech*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0292](#); *Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc. v. null John Zuccarini, Country Walk*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0487](#); see also [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.3).

### **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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the ERICSSON trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name entirely reproduces the Complainant's ERICSSON trademarks. The Panel finds that the Complainant's ERICSSON trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The addition of the term "support" does not prevent the finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8).

It is also well established that the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's ERICSSON trademarks 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. Specifically, the Respondent has failed to submit evidence of bona fide or legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. No evidence has been filed in connection with the Respondent being commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the Panel considers that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Therefore, 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.

The Complainant has ascertained its rights over the ERICSSON trademarks. The dates of registration of said trademarks significantly precede the date of registration of the disputed domain name. Additionally, the Panel agrees with decisions rendered by previous panels in the sense that the ERICSSON trademarks are well-known (see, for example, *Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson v. Younes Mersioui, Meilleurs Offres LTD* WIPO Case No. [D2024-0513](#) and *Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson v. eryuesheng song*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0019](#)).

Previous panels appointed under the Policy have found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a famous trademark by an unaffiliated entity can in itself create a presumption of bad faith (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.; see also *Ferrari S.p.A. v. Ms. Lee Joohee [for Joo-Hee]*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0882](#)). This is so in the present case because the Complainant's ERICSSON trademarks are well-known and have been extensively used worldwide.

According to the evidence comprised in the case file, the Respondent more likely than not provided false contact information since it listed "asdasd sadads" as its name. Previous panels appointed under the Policy have held that circumstances such as this one serve as an indication of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.6. Additionally, the Complainant owns ERICSSON trademark registrations in Australia, the place where the Respondent has declared to reside.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the fact that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name which entirely reproduces the Complainant's ERICSSON trademarks shows that the Respondent has targeted the Complainant, which constitutes opportunistic bad faith (see section 3.2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#); see also *L'Oréal v. Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0149511181 / Jerry Peter*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-1937](#); *Gilead Sciences Ireland UC / Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. Domain Maybe For Sale c/o Dynadot*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-0980](#); *Dream Marriage Group, Inc. v. Romantic Lines LP, Vadim Parhomchuk*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-1344](#); *Valentino S.p.A. v. Qiu Yufeng, Li Lianye*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1747](#), *Landesbank Baden-Württemberg (LBBW) v. David Amr*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-2322](#): "Given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent has registered the Disputed Domain Name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks, constituting opportunistic bad faith. The Panel finds it hard to see any other explanation than that the Respondent knew of the Complainant's well-known trademark").

The evidence submitted by the Complainant, and which has not been rebutted by the Respondent, shows that said Respondent is causing the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that comprises links which purpose is to allow for the downloading of mobile applications that apparently make available pornographic content. This use of the disputed domain name (which fully incorporates the well-known trademark ERICSSON) is not legitimate, nor can it constitute fair use. On the contrary, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name can misleadingly divert consumers, and it is tarnishing the Complainant's ERICSSON trademarks. Previous panels appointed under the Policy have found that this is an indication of bad faith use of a disputed domain name (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) section 3.12: see also *MatchNet plc. v. MAC Trading*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0205](#); *Andrey Ternovskiy dba Chatroulette v. Lukas Jansen*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-0781](#); and *SODEXO v. Nihat Bahçe, FN Market / Nihat BAHCE, fnmarket*, WIPO Case No. [DCC2015-0002](#)).

Based on the available record, 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 <ericsson-support.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Kiyoshi Tsuru/*

**Kiyoshi Tsuru**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 17, 2025