

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Elkjøp Nordic AS v. Jordan Papiads, JORPIPI
Case No. D2025-2109

1. The Parties

Complainant is Elkjøp Nordic AS, Norway, represented by Zacco Sweden AB, Sweden.

Respondent is Jordan Papiads, JORPIPI, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <elgigaten-sverige.com> is registered with eNom, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 28, 2025. On May 28, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same day, 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 Complainant on May 30, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on June 2, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 June 4, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 24, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on July 9, 2025.

The Center appointed Gabriel F. Leonardos as the sole panelist in this matter on July 23, 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 a Norwegian company founded in 1962 and a large electronics retailer in the Nordic countries, specifically Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Finland. In Sweden, Complainant was established as Elgiganten AB in 1993 and in the same year in Denmark as Elgiganten A/S. In addition, Complainant has franchises in Greenland, Iceland, and the Faroe Islands. Its operations are conducted under the marks ELKJØP, ELKJØP PHONEHOUSE, ELGIGANTEN, ELGIGANTEN PHONEHOUSE, GIGANTTI, ELKO, ELDING, and PISIFFIK.

Accordingly, Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations for the term ELGIGANTEN, as attached in Annexes 5.1-5.3 of the Complaint, and also owns domain names incorporating the ELGIGANTEN trademark, such as <elgiganten.com>, <elgiganten.dk> and <elgiganten.se>.

Registration	Trademark	Jurisdiction	International Classes	Registration Date
VR 2005 01853	ELGIGANTEN	Denmark	7, 8, 9, 11, 21, 35, 36, 37	May 24, 2005
005908678	ELGIGANTEN	European Union	7, 8, 9, 11, 21, 35, 36, 37	May 30, 2008
011148913		European Union	7, 8, 9, 11, 14, 16, 20, 21, 28, 35, 37	March 6, 2013

The disputed domain name was registered on December 16, 2024, and used to resolve to a website that used the ELGIGANTEN trademark and appeared to be associated with or endorsed by Complainant.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, Complainant contends that the disputed domain name includes a confusingly similar spelling of the Complainant's trademark ELGIGANTEN and only adds the term "sverige", which translates to "Sweden" in Swedish and does not prevent confusion.

Therefore, according to Complainant, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar with Complainant's trademark ELGIGANTEN and owned domain names, fulfilling paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy and paragraphs 3(b)(viii) and (b)(ix)(1) of the Rules.

Complainant states that it has not given a license or authorization of any kind for the registration or use of the trademark ELGIGANTEN as a domain name. Moreover, Complainant affirms that Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services but for a website designed to impersonate Complainant's official websites.

According to Complainant, Respondent attempts to create a false connection between the disputed domain name and Complainant's activities. There is no information available about Respondent, nor any disclosure of a relationship with Complainant.

In this manner, Complainant states that no legitimate use of the disputed domain names could be reasonably claimed by Respondent, fulfilling paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy and paragraph 3(b)(ix)(2) of the Rules.

Complainant affirms that it holds trademark registrations that date back to 2005, whereas the disputed domain name was registered on December 16, 2024. For this reason, Complainant argues that Respondent was aware of Complainant's rights at the time of registration.

According to Complainant, Respondent's purpose is to create a false impression that the website under the disputed domain name is affiliated with or operated by Complainant for either commercial, illicit, or fraudulent purposes. For this reason, Complainant states that it has sent a cease-and-desist letter to Respondent requesting the transfer of the disputed domain name but has not received a response.

Lastly, Complainant affirms that Respondent has a history of registering domain names in bad faith and that Complainant was one of the targets of its typosquatting scheme.

Thus, according to Complainant, the requirements for a finding of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name have been fulfilled, pursuant to paragraphs 4(a)(iii) and 4(b) of the Policy, and paragraph 3(b)(ix)(3) of the Rules.

Accordingly, Complainant requests that the disputed domain names be transferred to it.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed in a UDRP complaint, Complainant must demonstrate that all the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, as following:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) 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.

The burden of proving these elements is upon Complainant.

Respondent had 20 days to submit a response in accordance with paragraph 5(a) of the Rules and failed to do so. Paragraph 5(f) of the Rules establishes that if a respondent does not respond to the complaint, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel's decision shall be based upon the complaint.

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 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.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 trademark ELGIGANTEN is recognizable 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.

The Panel acknowledges the difference in spelling between ELGIGANTEN and "elgigaten", but finds that the simple omission of the first letter "n" in the disputed domain name is insufficient to avoid confusion with Complainant's trademark in view of the strong similarity of the two terms.

Although the addition of the geographical term "sverige" in the disputed domain name may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that such addition 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.

Therefore, based on the available record, 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 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.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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 impersonation can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Based on the available record, Respondent is not entitled to any trademark, trade name, or any other right associated with the disputed domain name. Additionally, Respondent has not been authorized by Complainant to use the ELGIGANTEN trademark, and there is no commercial relationship between the Parties. Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. In light of these circumstances, the Panel finds that no rights or legitimate interests can be found on behalf of Respondent.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that Respondent has registered a domain name that is confusingly similar to Complainant’s trademark ELGIGANTEN. Also, based on the available record, it is established that Respondent has no affiliation with Complainant and the trademark ELGIGANTEN nor has it sought authorization or a license to utilize the referred trademark. Moreover, Respondent does not own any trademarks containing the term “elgigaten”, nor has it demonstrated any rights in the trademark or any related terms.

Furthermore, considering Complainant’s significant reputation in the Nordic countries, Respondent evidently knew or should have known of the existence of Complainant’s prior trademark rights and domain names, which were matters of public record, prior to registering the disputed domain name. Other than this, considering Respondent’s documented use of the ELGIGANTEN trademark on the website, as well as including the addition of the term “sverige” in the disputed domain name, which translates to “Sweden” and corresponds to one the countries related to Complainant’s business activities, the Panel finds that Respondent evidently had knowledge of Complainant’s pre-existing rights to the ELGIGANTEN trademark.

The registration of the disputed domain name was carried out by Respondent, who had the responsibility to verify the existence of the said trademark. The Panel notes that Respondent is indeed impersonating

Complainant's business, including the use of an identical website layout, with the intention of confusing Internet consumers. Moreover, the removal of the letter "n" from the term "ELGIGANTEN", indicates that Respondent is indeed engaged in a typosquatting scheme, which further supports a finding of bad faith. See *Hyperion Materials & Technologies AB v. Osama Osama*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-0251](#).

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (i.e. impersonation/passing off), constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy. See *Dragonsteel, LLC v. web master, Expired domain caught by auction winner. ***Maybe for sale on Dynadot Marketplace****, WIPO Case No. [D2024-2445](#).

Therefore, the Panel finds that the circumstances of the present case support a finding of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name, considering that (i) Respondent attempted to impersonate or pass itself off as Complainant; and (ii) Respondent was most likely aware of Complainant's rights in the trademark ELGIGANTEN, especially considering Respondent's previous use of the website under the disputed domain name, which aimed to create a likelihood of confusion among Internet users and give the false impression of an association with Complainant.

Lastly, the Panel finds that it is relevant that Respondent has not provided any evidence of good faith registration or use, nor otherwise participated in this proceeding or responded to the cease-and-desist letter first sent out by Complainant.

Based on the available record, 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 disputed domain name <elgigaten-sverige.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Gabriel F. Leonardos/

Gabriel F. Leonardos

Sole Panelist

Date: August 6, 2025