

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Valmet Technologies Oy v. Aaron Bloy  
Case No. D2025-2357

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Valmet Technologies Oy, Finland, represented by Roschier (Brands), Attorneys Ltd., Finland.

The Respondent is Aaron Bloy, United States of America ("United States").

### 2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <beloitparts.com>, <beloitspareparts.com>, <glvparts.com>, <glvspareparts.com>, <valmetparts.com> and <valmetspareparts.com> are registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 16, 2025. On June 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 16, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 18, 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 22, 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 25, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 15, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 16, 2025.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev as the sole panelist in this matter on August 4, 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 developer and supplier of process technologies, automation and services for the pulp, paper and energy industries. It has over 225 years of history and 19,000 employees, and its net sales in 2024 were approximately EUR 5.4 billion. In 2000, the Complainant acquired the assets of the United States paper manufacturer Beloit, and in 2019, it acquired GL&V, a supplier of technologies, services and spare parts for the pulp and paper industry. The Complainant operates its official website at the domain name <valmet.com>.

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registrations for VALMET (the “VALMET trademark”):

- the United States trademark VALMET with registration No. 1517756, registered on December 27, 1988 for goods and services in International Classes 7 and 37; and
- the European Union trademark VALMET with registration No. 002088904, registered on June 19, 2002 for goods and services in International Classes 7 and 37.

The Complainant is the owner of the United States trademark GL&V with registration No. 2804044, registered on January 13, 2004 for goods in International Class 7 (the “GL&V trademark”).

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registrations for BELOIT (the “BELOIT trademark”):

- the United States trademark BELOIT with registration No. 614351, registered on October 18, 1955 for services in International Class 7; and
- the United Kingdom trademark BELOIT with registration No. UK00001054870, registered on November 14, 1975 for goods in International Class 7.

The disputed domain names were registered on June 21, 2010. They all redirect to the website at the domain name <jsimillsolutions.com>, which displays the heading “JSI Paper Mill Parts & Maintenance | JSI Mill Solutions”, and offers various paper mill solutions, spare parts and maintenance services under the brand JSI MILL SOLUTIONS. The “About Us” section of the website contains the following text (among others): *“Top-Notch Products With a commitment to quality, our products are engineered to match or exceed OEM parts, providing unmatched reliability and sustainability.”* The same section of the website also states that the Mr. Aaron Bloy (i.e., the Respondent) is one of the founders of JSI Mill Solutions and serves as its President and Chief Technical Officer.

#### 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 names.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to trademarks in which it has rights. The disputed domain names <valmetparts.com> and <valmetspareparts.com> incorporate its VALMET trademark, the disputed domain names <glvparts.com> and <glvspareparts.com> incorporate the equivalent of its GL&V trademark (because the ampersand cannot be included in domain names), and the

disputed domain names <beloitparts.com> and <beloitspareparts.com> incorporate its BELOIT trademark. The Complainant adds that the additional elements “parts” and “spare parts” in the disputed domain names are non-distinctive dictionary words.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names, because it has no relevant trademark rights, has not been licensed by the Complainant to use its trademarks or to register the disputed domain names, and there is no relationship between the Parties. The Complainant submits that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of them, because all disputed domain names redirect to the website at the domain name <jsimillsolutions.com>, which offers various paper mill solutions, parts and spare parts under the brand JSI MILL SOLUTIONS in competition with the Complainant.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. It points out that the disputed domain names incorporate its three distinctive trademarks, and redirect to a website that operates in the same field as the Complainant and offers competing goods. According to the Complainant, this shows that the Respondent has intentionally selected and registered the disputed domain names to confuse Internet users searching for the Complainant’s branded goods in order to redirect them, for commercial gain, to a website selling competing products. The Complainant notes that the content of the website at the domain name <jsimillsolutions.com> shows that the Respondent is one of the founders of the company operating that website.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **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 the VALMET, GL&V and BELOIT trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the VALMET trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain names <valmetparts.com> and <valmetspareparts.com>, that the GL&V trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain names <glvparts.com> and <glvspareparts.com>, and that the BELOIT trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain names <beloitparts.com> and <beloitspareparts.com>. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the trademarks in which the Complainant has rights for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, “parts” and “spareparts”) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Complainant’s trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel therefore 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The disputed domain names are confusingly similar to trademarks in which the Complainant has rights and are being used to redirect visitors to the website of the company JSI Mill Solutions, which offers competing products and services to those offered by the Complainant under its VALMET, GL&V and BELOIT trademarks. According to that website, it offers its own products, and not OEM products, which the Panel understands to mean that the Respondent does not offer the Complainant’s products. The website of JSI Mill Solutions also states that the Respondent is the President of this company, which supports a conclusion that this website is under the control of the Respondent.

Considering all the above, and in the absence of any plausible explanation or supporting evidence suggesting a different conclusion, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain names to confuse and attract visitors looking for the Complainant’s products and services and redirect them to its own website where to offer them competing products and services. This is not a legitimate conduct that may give rise to rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain names.

Therefore, the Panel finds that 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 the Respondent has registered six domain names, each of which incorporates one of the Complainant’s distinctive trademarks in combination with the dictionary words “parts” or “spare parts”. This creates an appearance that the disputed domain names resolve to official online locations that offer spare parts for the Complainant’s products. The disputed domain names, however, resolve to a website that has no relationship with the Complainant and offers its own products and services that compete with the Complainant’s offerings, and the Respondent has provided no plausible explanation for its registration and use of the disputed domain names.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that by registering and using the disputed domain names, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website that is under his control by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademarks as to the affiliation to or

endorsement by the Complainant of the products and services offered on the website to which the disputed domain names redirect.

The Panel therefore 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 names <beloitparts.com>, <beloitspareparts.com>, <glvparts.com>, <glvspareparts.com>, <valmetparts.com> and <valmetspareparts.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Assen Alexiev/*

**Assen Alexiev**

Sole Panelist

Date: August 13, 2025