

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Maurten AB v. DU DU
Case No. D2025-2502

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Maurten AB, Sweden, represented by Zacco Sweden AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is DU DU, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <maurten.health> is 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 25, 2025. On June 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 25, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 26, 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 27, 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 July 1, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 21, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 23, 2025.

The Center appointed Ganna Prokhorova as the sole panelist in this matter on July 28, 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 limited liability company established in 2015 and based in Gothenburg. The Complainant is a leading innovator in the field of sports nutrition, known for developing hydrogel-based carbohydrate-rich drinks and energy gels. These products are widely used by elite athletes, including Olympic medallists, world champions, and top marathoners, due to their enhanced gastrointestinal tolerance and performance-enhancing qualities.

The Complainant cooperates with international research institutions and maintains an active global presence, including through its official website at “www.maurten.com”.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for the mark MAURTEN, including the following:

- European Union Trade Mark No. 018787866, registered on March 6, 2023, for goods and services in Classes 9, 21, 30, 35, 41, and 45;
- International Registration No. 1401151, registered on November 19, 2017, for goods in Classes 5, 25 and 32, designating various jurisdictions, including China; and
- International Registration No. 1733568, registered on April 6, 2023, for goods and services in Classes 9, 21, 30, 35, 41, and 45, designating various jurisdictions, including China.

The MAURTEN mark has been continuously used by the Complainant in commerce since 2015 in connection with sports fuel products and services.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 15, 2025. According to the evidence in the case file, it initially resolved to a parked page offering the domain name for sale at a price of USD 1,999.00. As of the date of this decision, the disputed domain name continues to resolve to a parked page, now offering it for sale at a price of USD 3,500.00.

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:

(1) The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's registered trademark MAURTEN. The Complainant owns trademark rights in multiple jurisdictions, including the European Union and the United States of America, where the MAURTEN trademark has been in use for many years. The addition of the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.health” is irrelevant when determining the similarity between the mark and the disputed domain name..

(2) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the MAURTEN trademark in any capacity. The Respondent is neither affiliated with nor known by the Complainant, and is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, the disputed domain name is offered for sale at a price far exceeding standard registration costs.

(3) The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name long after the Complainant's trademark rights arose and did so with knowledge of the Complainant's rights. The Respondent's offer to sell the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith. The Respondent's failure to respond to a cease and desist letter further supports this conclusion. The Respondent's conduct is a clear example of cybersquatting.

The Complainant asks the disputed domain name to be transferred.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions. Before the filing of the Complaint, the Respondent answered to the infringement notice sent by the Complainant via the Registrar by sending an email to the Complainant's representative, in which the disputed domain name was offered for sale for EUR 3,800.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules provides that the Panel is to decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, the Rules, and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

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

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights;
- (ii) the 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 Panel will further analyze the potential concurrence of the above circumstances.

Moreover, the Panel has taken note of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)") and, where appropriate, will decide consistent with the consensus views captured therein.

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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Panel confirms that for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy the Complainant has satisfied the threshold requirement of having relevant trademark rights for MAURTEN in jurisdictions throughout the world, including in China where the Respondent domiciles.

The disputed domain name incorporates the MAURTEN mark in full, without alteration or addition. It is well accepted by UDRP panels that a gTLD, such as ".health", is typically ignored when assessing whether a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark. See section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#). Therefore, the Panel is of the view that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's mark.

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 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.

In the present case, the Complainant has established a prima facie case that it holds rights over the trademark MAURTEN and claims that the Respondent has no legitimate reason to acquire and use the disputed domain name.

The Complainant’s un rebutted evidence establishes that its MAURTEN trademark was registered and is well-known prior to registration of the disputed domain name. The term “maurten” is not descriptive in any way, nor does it have any generic, dictionary meaning. There is no evidence in the case file that there are MAURTEN trademarks likely to be held by the Respondent.

The case file also does not contain any evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name as an individual, business, or other organization.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has not used, nor prepared to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, and the Panel agrees.

For the reasons discussed in relation to bad faith below, it is likely that the Respondent’s intention was to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant for valuable consideration in excess of its out-of-pocket costs due to its identity with the Complainant’s mark. This cannot confer rights or legitimate interests.

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 Complainant claims that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, and the Panel agrees.

The Panel notes that the Complainant’s trademark MAURTEN is a coined term with no inherent dictionary meaning or descriptive quality. It is neither generic nor commonly used in relation to the relevant goods or services. This enhances its distinctiveness and makes it unlikely that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant’s mark. Therefore, the Panel is convinced that the Respondent’s awareness amounts to opportunistic bad faith registration. See *Skyscanner Limited v. Sharoyan Ramzik Samvelovich*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-2754](#).

It is therefore highly unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of the existence of the Complainant and its well-known reputation and MAURTEN trademarks while it registered the disputed domain name. On the contrary, considering the reputation of the Complainant, the fact that the disputed domain name is identical

to the Complainant's MAURTEN trademark, it is most likely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name having the Complainant's trademarks in mind.

Furthermore, the fact that the disputed domain name appears to be offered for sale is an indication of a use in bad faith. Indeed, while offering domain names for sale is not per se constitutive of bad faith, it is well established that offering a domain name that includes a prior trademark is a bad-faith use, all the more when the concerned trademark is famous.

Further, the Respondent's failure to respond to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter is additional evidence of bad faith. Moreover, the Respondent has not participated in these proceedings and has failed to rebut the Complainant's contentions and to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use and indeed none would seem plausible.

Therefore, the Complainant has demonstrated that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name reproducing identically the Complainant's MAURTEN trademark. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website.

Moreover, the Respondent appears in a prior UDRP proceeding (see *Frankie Shop LLC v. DU DU*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1652](#)), which may support a finding of a pattern of abusive registrations.

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 <maurten.health> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ganna Prokhorova/

Ganna Prokhorova

Sole Panelist

Date: August 8, 2025