

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Archer-Daniels-Midland Company (ADM) v. Damilola Korede
Case No. D2025-2232

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Archer-Daniels-Midland Company (ADM), United States of America, represented by Innis Law Group LLC, United States of America.

The Respondent is Damilola Korede, Nigeria.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <admsalesdepts.com> is registered with GMO Internet, Inc. d/b/a Discount-Domain.com and Onamae.com (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 6, 2025. On June 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 20, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 20, 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 amendment to the Complaint on June 20, 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 13, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 14, 2025.

The Center appointed George R. F. Souter as the sole panelist in this matter on July 21, 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, founded in 1902, is one of the world's largest agribusinesses. Originally a food and ingredients company, the Complainant's business areas also now include printing and publishing, financial and business management services, fuel production, including bioethanol and biodiesel, logistics (agricultural storage and transportation services), and research and development services. The Complainant sells its products and services under its ADM trademark in 200 countries, with 800 facilities worldwide, and employs over 38,000 people. Its worldwide net sales in 2023 were USD 93 billion.

The Complainant has provided the Panel with details of numerous registrations of its ADM trademark internationally, including European Union Trade Mark No. 913194, registered on February 15, 2001.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 14, 2025, it resolves to a parked webpage, and is purportedly being used, including using the real name of a genuine employee of the Complainant, and a fake email address, to contact potential vendors of the Complainant concerning possible commercial interests of the Complainant.

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 Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent has never received consent from the Complainant to use its ADM trademark in connection with the registration of a domain name, or otherwise.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[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. The mere addition of "salesdepts" to the Complainant's ADM trademark does not disturb this finding.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

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 finds it implausible that the disputed domain name was registered without using the Complainant's mark for commercial gain in mind, and the subsequent use of the disputed domain name to send communications from the disputed domain name impersonating the Complainant confirms this. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for impersonation constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record of this case, which discloses a clear attempt at impersonation of the Complainant by the Respondent, the Panel finds that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name constitutes 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 <admsalesdepts.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/George R. F. Souter/

George R. F. Souter

Sole Panelist

Date: August 4, 2025