

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

VDA Verband der Automobilindustrie e.V. v. Sorin Vorindan  
Case No. D2025-1510

### **1. The Parties**

Complainant is VDA Verband der Automobilindustrie e.V., Germany, represented by Kroher Strobel Rechts- und Patentanwälte PartmbB, Germany.

Respondent is Sorin Vorindan, Romania.

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

The disputed domain name <adblue.business> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 14, 2025. On April 14, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On April 15, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name, which differed from named Respondent (GDRP Masked) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on April 16, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and requesting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on April 17, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 7, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on May 8, 2025.

The Center appointed Clive L. Elliott K.C., as the sole panelist in this matter on May 14, 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

Complainant is an interest group of the German automotive industry, including both automobile manufacturers and automobile component suppliers. Complainant actively pursues the interests of the German automotive industry in sectors such as the aftermarket, electric mobility, logistics and customs and excise.

Complainant is the owner of numerous trade marks for ADBLUE (“Complainant’s Mark”) including, but not limited to:

Mark	Jurisdiction	Registration No.	Registration Date	Classes
ADBLUE	International	811899	August 8, 2003	1
ADBLUE	Romania	064581	May 24, 2005	1, 4, 7, 42
AdBLUE	European Union	003945938	February 6, 2006	1, 4, 12, 37, 42
ADBLUE	European Union	008526717	March 8, 2010	6, 7, 9, 20, 35, 42
ADBLUE	International	1042880	May 18, 2010	7, 9, 12, 39

According to the publicly available Whois, the Domain Name was registered on July 3, 2017, and at the time of the Decision, the Domain Name resolved to a site offering identical goods, i.e., urea solution for reducing NOx emissions in vehicles.

#### 5. Parties’ Contentions

##### A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

Notably, Complainant contends that Complainant’s Mark is a well-known trade mark used for urea that reduces the NOx emissions of diesel engines, particularly in the field of commercial and heavy goods vehicles. Complainant further contends that, in an effort to protect and enforce Complainant’s Mark worldwide, it has established a licensing system for companies in the chemical industry who supply and manufacture urea.

Complainant asserts that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant’s Mark as it contains Complainant’s Mark in its entirety, with the only difference being the non-distinctive generic Top-Level Domain “business”. Complainant submits that this addition of non-distinctive text to Complainant’s Mark constitutes confusing similarity.

Complainant further contends that Respondent’s use and registration of the Domain Name was not authorized by Complainant, that no connection exists between Complainant and Respondent, and Respondent is not making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the Domain Name. Complainant goes on to state that the Domain Name is used to host a website offering identical goods, i.e., urea solution for the reduction of NOx emissions in vehicles, as well as displaying Complainant’s Mark. Complainant notes that the goods currently offered by Respondent are original “AdBlue” products manufactured by a licensee but points out that this use within the distribution channel does not legitimize the use of Complainant’s Mark as a business or domain name.

Complainant submits that Respondent has registered the Domain Name intentionally in an attempt to attract for commercial gain Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website.

## **B. Respondent**

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

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 Complainant's Mark and the Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

Complainant's Mark is incorporated in its entirety within the Domain Name. The Panel finds that the Domain Name is identical to the mark 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 Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a 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 respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name (although the burden of proof always remains on complainant). If respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

The Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Respondent has not questioned or rebutted Complainant's prima facie showing and has not provided an argument or relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Of particular significance in the present case, it is alleged that the Domain Name is used to host a website offering identical goods, namely urea solutions for the reduction of NOx emissions in vehicles. Further, it is alleged that Respondent is using Complainant's Mark. Complainant accepts that the goods currently offered by Respondent are original "AdBlue" products manufactured by a licensee, rather than being counterfeit goods, but Complainant points out that this use, within the distribution channel, does not legitimize the use of Complainant's Mark as a business or domain name.

In this regard, the Panel is satisfied that the make up of the Domain Name, incorporating Complainant's Mark in its entirety without any addition of a descriptive term carries a high risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Moreover, there is no evidence that Respondent is actually commonly known by the Domain Name. Instead, it suggests that Respondent intended to suggest an affiliation or association with Complainant, when none exists.

Accordingly, 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 Panel notes that the composition of the Domain Name, incorporating Complainant's Mark entirely and providing similar goods, suggests Respondent knew of and sought to take advantage of Complainant's Mark when registering the Domain Name. As noted above, Respondent is alleged to have engaged in unauthorised activities in connection with Complainant's Mark and held itself out as a legitimate partner or licensee on the website at the domain name, when that is not the case. Finally, Respondent has failed to put forward any justification for doing so.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that 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 Domain Name <adblue.business> be cancelled.

*/Clive L. Elliott K.C./*

**Clive L. Elliott K.C.**

Sole Panelist

Date: May 30, 2025