

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Essity Hygiene and Health AB v. Ronda Fives
Case No. D2025-2349

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Essity Hygiene and Health AB, Sweden, represented by Dorsey & Whitney, LLP, United States of America (“United States”).

The Respondent is Ronda Fives, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <careersessity.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 13, 2025. On June 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 16, 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 (Domain Administrator, See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 17, 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 June 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 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 15, 2025.

The Center appointed Warwick Smith 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 is a Swedish corporation that is part of the Essity Group. The Essity Group operates internationally in the development, production, and selling of personal care products (including baby care and feminine care products, consumer tissue and professional hygiene products, and medical solutions). According to the Amended Complaint, the Complainant and its affiliates operate in approximately 150 countries around the world, marketing the Group's products under global brands such as TENA and TORK. The Complainant's group is said to have approximately 48,000 employees worldwide, and its net sales in 2024 were approximately USD 15.2 billion.

The Complainant is the registered proprietor of a range of (word and figurative) trademarks and/or service marks in numerous jurisdictions around the world consisting of or containing the expression "ESSITY". It is not necessary to refer to every jurisdiction in which the Complainant's ESSITY mark is registered. As the Respondent appears to be domiciled in the United States, the Panel highlights that the Complainant has sufficiently proved that it has been the proprietor of both word and figurative ESSITY trademarks in the United States since July 2019.

The Complainant owns, inter alia, the following trademark registrations in the United States:

- ESSITY, United States registration no. 5,906,062, registered on November 12, 2019;
- ESSITY, United States registration no. 5,803,014, registered on July 16, 2019;
- EEEEEEE ESSITY (figurative), United States registration no. 5,791,220, registered on July 2, 2019 (the "ESSITY figurative mark").

The Complainant says that it has used its ESSITY marks from as early as 2017 in connection with its health and hygiene business, and that it has since made a considerable investment of time, effort, and money in advertising and promoting its health and hygiene products under its ESSITY marks. The Complainant actively promotes and advertises its business and products online using its ESSITY marks, including through its website at "www.essity.com". The Complainant also uses that website to attract job seekers interested in careers working for the Complainant.

In addition to that website, the Complainant operates an Instagram account using the name "@essitycareers".

The disputed domain name was registered on May 17, 2025. As of June 6, 2025, the disputed domain name was used, in part, to redirect users to the Complainant's official website at <essity.com>. However, the Complainant provides evidence that the disputed domain name was used to perpetuate an email phishing campaign, whereby the Respondent reaches out to potential employment candidates posing as a recruiter for the Complainant.

The Complainant produced copies of two emails dated June 2, 2025, in which the sender communicated with a prospective employee of the Complainant. The email headings were "re Administrative Assistant Application" and "re Interview Times" respectively, and a link was provided in the emails to a webpage where further information about the purported employment opportunity was provided. In the information available through this link the sender of the two emails was described as the "Interview Manager", with a Microsoft Teams Username of "[name of email sender]@careersessity.com".

On June 4, 2025, the prospective employee received an email from “Essity Careers”, headed “Essity Employment Letter.pdf”. The letter purported to welcome the prospective employee to “Essity” and set out various details of the orientation and training process the prospective employee would be expected to undertake on induction (and the equipment that would have to be acquired for the prospective employee to complete the orientation and training). The ESSITY figurative mark was reproduced at the top of the second page of the “Essity Employment Letter”.

In its Amended Complaint, the Complainant referred to a specific incident in which a prospective employee was invited to apply for a “Remote Administrative Assistant” position with the Complainant group. The prospective employee completed an attached application form and then received an email from the individual who claimed to be the Essity “Interview Manager” in the email correspondence referred to above. The “Interview Manager” provided instructions for the prospective employee to participate in an interview with her using the MS Teams “chat” function, and the Complainant produced what appeared to be extracts of the text of the MS Teams Chat “conversation”.

In the course of the MS Teams chat, the “Interview Manager” asked the prospective employee to make a payment using the Zelle money transfer system. The name of the party to receive the money was provided, with a gmail address that appeared to be a personal one. When the prospective employee questioned the legitimacy of this request, the “Interview Manager” proposed an alternative option, under which the prospective employee would print and endorse a check that would be emailed to them, lodge the endorsed check in their bank account, and send a copy of the deposit slip to the Interview Manager as evidence that the deposit had been made.

The Complainant says that it does not have any employee with a name corresponding to the author of these email communications (referred to above as “the Interview Manager”), and nor has it had an open job posting for a “Remote Administrative Assistant”.

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. Specifically, it contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its ESSITY marks, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

On the first of those elements, the Complainant says that its ESSITY mark is incorporated in full in the disputed domain name and is readily recognizable within it. That is sufficient to establish confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s ESSITY marks.

On the second element (Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name), the Complainant contends that it has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to register a domain name incorporating the Complainant’s ESSITY mark, and the Respondent had constructive notice of the Complainant’s trademark rights in that mark by virtue of the Complainant’s registration of its ESSITY mark in the United States. The Respondent is not commonly known by the name “Essity”, and the Respondent has not been making any fair or legitimate use of the disputed domain name or using the disputed domain name in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services.

On the third element (registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith), the Complainant contends that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, and has been using it, for the bad faith purpose of passing itself off as the Complainant, inducing potential job applicants to disclose their confidential information in the belief that they are applying for a real job with the Complainant. The Complainant contends that it is inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without the intention of capitalizing on the goodwill the Complainant owns in its ESSITY marks. The use of

the ESSITY figurative mark in the letterhead of the “employment offer letter” provides clear evidence of the Respondent’s knowledge of the Complainant and her intention to use the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name (i) with the specific intent to cause consumer confusion and to obtain a free ride on the internationally recognized goodwill associated with the Complainant’s ESSITY marks and / or (ii) for the purpose of creating the false impression that the Respondent is a member, licensee, or representative of the Complainant, which the Respondent is not, all for the purpose of improperly accessing or obtaining personal and confidential information.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, a complainant is required to establish each of the following:

- (i) the 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 domain name; and
- (iii) the 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, namely the ESSITY mark that it has registered in the United States. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the ESSITY 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 inclusion of other terms with a complainant’s mark in a disputed domain name may in some cases bear on the assessment of the second and third elements of the Policy, it does not normally affect the panel’s assessment of the first element. In this case, the Panel finds that the addition of the term “careers” in this case does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s ESSITY mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

For completeness, the Panel notes that generic Top-Level Domains (“gTLDs”) such as “.com” are not normally taken into account in the comparison that is required by paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. The gTLD is a technical requirement of registration and is not normally considered to have legal significance in applying paragraph 4(a)(i).¹

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

¹[WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4 (c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which a 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 respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not been licensed or otherwise authorized to use the Complainant’s ESSITY mark, whether in a domain name or otherwise, and there is nothing in the record to suggest that the Respondent is or might be commonly known by the disputed domain name (a “safe harbor” defense provided for in paragraph 4 (c) (ii) of the Policy). It is clear that the Respondent has attempted to pass herself off as the Complainant, including by redirecting the disputed domain name to the Complainant’s website, purporting to offer job seekers employment with the Complainant for the purposes of obtaining their confidential personal information, and by copying the ESSITY figurative mark in the letterhead of the “employment offer letter”, and those activities could never qualify as use of the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services as provided for in paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy), or as a fair or legitimate noncommercial use of the disputed domain name provided for in paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy).²

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 therefore finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

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.

It is quite clear that the Respondent acted in bad faith in her registration and subsequent use of the disputed domain name. As for bad faith registration, the Panel is satisfied that the Respondent knew of the Complainant’s ESSITY marks when she registered the disputed domain name. That is clear from her action in pointing the disputed domain name to the Complainant’s (legitimate) website, and from her actions in passing herself off as the Complainant in the phony employment email correspondence and copying the ESSITY figurative mark on the letterhead of the “employment offer letter”. Those actions were taken only within three weeks of the Respondent registering the disputed domain name. The registration of the disputed domain name could only have been for the phishing purpose alleged by the Complainant, and there is no doubt that registration and use of a disputed domain name for that purpose qualifies as both bad faith registration and bad faith use. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activities (including phishing, impersonation of a complainant, and passing off) – all of which have been established in this case – constitute bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

²Panels have held that the use of a domain name for various types of illegal or illegitimate behavior (including phishing, the impersonation of a complainant, and passing off), can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and 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 <careersessity.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Warwick Smith/

Warwick Smith

Sole Panelist

Date: August 4, 2025