

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Yleisradio Oy v. Umer Mirza, EBPRO Media LTD
Case No. D2025-2762

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Yleisradio Oy, Finland, represented by Papula Oy, Finland.

The Respondent is Umer Mirza, EBPRO Media LTD, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <yleuutiset.com> is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 14, 2025. On July 14, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 15, 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 (Redacted for Privacy, EBPRO Media LTD) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 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 amendment to the Complaint on July 22, 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 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 13, 2025. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on July 17, 2025.

The Center appointed Johan Sjöbeck as the sole panelist in this matter on August 22, 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 has submitted evidence that it is the owner of a number of YLE trademark registrations in various classes, including:

YLE, European Union (“EU”) trademark (word) with registration number 018141990, filed on October 23, 2019, and registered on February 27, 2020, for goods and services in classes 9, 35, 38, 41, 42, 45.

YLE, EU trademark (figurative) with registration number 018142261, filed on October 24, 2019, and registered on February 27, 2020, for goods and services in classes 9, 35, 38, 41, 42, 45.

YLE, EU trademark (figurative) with registration number 004062691, filed on October 11, 2004 and registered on November 9, 2005, for goods and services in classes 9, 16, 25, 28, 35, 38, 41, 42.

The disputed domain name <yleutiset.com> was registered by the Respondent on December 20, 2024. The disputed domain name directs to a website that displays the Complainant’s trademark together with news content in the Finnish language.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant, Yleisradio Oy, is Finland's national public broadcasting company, founded in 1926. It is organized as a limited company almost fully owned by the Finnish state. The Complainant operates three TV channels on three channel slots and five channels on the radio, and reaches approximately 92% of Finns every week. The Complainant’s operations are funded by a public broadcasting tax, known as the Yle tax, which is collected annually from private individuals and corporations together with their other taxes.

The Complainant’s online services are among the most popular in Finland. The Complainant’s trademark YLE is used for all of its services, including that of electronic transmission of news. Additionally, the Complainant uses the name YLE Uutiset in connection with all the news it broadcasts online.

The Complainant’s trademark YLE is well-known in Finland and the distinctiveness of the trademark is very high. The people in Finland trust the Complainant’s news, and YLE is perceived as the most trusted news media in Finland. Moreover, in year 2020, YLE was selected as the third most highly valued of all Finnish brands. In 2021, the Finland Chamber of Commerce selected YLE as the brand of the year. Latest, in 2024, the brand YLE was placed tenth in Taloustutkimus’ survey of most valued brands in Finland.

The disputed domain name <yleutiset.com> is used for news publication, and thus used for identical and similar services which the Complainant’s prior marks are registered and used for. The disputed domain name is highly similar to the YLE trademark as well as the YLE-formative trademarks of the Complainant.

The Complainant’s registered trademark YLE has no meaning as such and is inherently highly distinctive for the registered goods and services. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant’s trademark in its entirety in combination with the descriptive term “uutiset”, meaning “news” in Finnish. Considering the above, it is submitted that the disputed domain name is highly similar to the Complainant’s prior trademark YLE.

Insofar as the Respondent's rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name are concerned, it may be noted first of all that the letter combination YLE is inherently distinctive for the goods and services covered by the Complainant's trademarks, including news broadcasting and publication services. As such, there is no conceivable bona fide reason for the use of this distinctive mark, or a variation of this mark, in a domain name by a third party without prior consent.

The disputed domain name is used for the broadcasting of national news in the Finnish language. The website, to which the disputed domain name resolves, displays the Complainant's trademark YLE.

The Complainant has not authorized or licensed such use of its trademarks, and neither is the Complainant connected or affiliated with the Respondent in any way. It is moreover concluded that the Respondent is not making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Instead, the Respondent is using a domain name which is identical and similar to the Complainant's registered trademarks, falsely suggesting an affiliation with the Complainant and misleadingly diverting Internet users and tarnishing the Complainant's trademarks by creating a website offering identical services and replicating therein the Complainant's trademark.

As noted above, the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's prior trademark YLE, and is also used for identical services, including electronic transmission of news. Moreover, the language used on the Respondent's website is Finnish. Taking into account the reputation and long-standing use of the Complainant's trademarks in Finland, it is in the Complainant's view not plausible that the Respondent would not have been aware of the Complainant's prior trademarks when registering the domain name. As such, the registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar to the highly distinctive and well-known trademarks of the Complainant itself creates a presumption of bad faith.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent is not making any legitimate use of the disputed domain name. Instead, the Respondent is inappropriately and intentionally de-frauding actual or potential visitors into believing that the disputed domain name is associated with the Complainant. The disputed domain name has thus been registered for the purpose of disrupting the business or activities of the Complainant by intentionally creating an association between the Complainant and the Respondent and applying the Complainant's trademarks in a corresponding domain name. Furthermore, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's well-known trademarks. In conclusion, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name has been registered, and is being used, in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions, however, sent an email to the Center on July 17, 2025, confirming receipt of the Center's email.

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that the disputed 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 threshold test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. It is standard practice to disregard the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") under the confusingly similar test. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), sections 1.7 and 1.11.

The Complainant is, according to the submitted evidence, the owner of the registered trademark YLE. The disputed domain name <yleuutiset.com> incorporates the trademark in its entirety with the addition of the descriptive term "uutiset", meaning "news" in Finnish. The addition of the term "uutiset" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element test.

Having the above in mind, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name <yleuutiset.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark and that the Complainant has proven the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant must show that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name. The Respondent may establish rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name by demonstrating in accordance with paragraph 4(c) of the Policy any of the following:

- (i) that the Respondent uses or has made preparations to use the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services prior to the dispute; or
- (ii) that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, even if the Respondent has not acquired any trademark rights; or
- (iii) that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark.

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. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

The Complainant's trademark registrations for YLE predate the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not licensed, approved or in any way consented to the Respondent's registration and use of the trademark in the disputed domain name.

The evidence in the case indicates that the Respondent has attempted to create an impression of a website created by, belonging to, or endorsed by the Complainant. The Respondent's website, to which the disputed domain name resolves, reproduces the term YLE in a font similar to the Complainant's trademark registration in combination with the publication of national news in the Finnish language. Thus, Internet users may falsely believe that the disputed domain name belongs to or is somehow endorsed by the Complainant.

The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie case or submitted any evidence to demonstrate that the Respondent is the owner of any trademark rights similar to the disputed domain name

or that the Respondent is or has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark.

Hence, the Respondent has failed to invoke any circumstances which could demonstrate, pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. Given that the Respondent did not come forward with any explanation or evidence that refutes the Complainant's prima facie case, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has also proved the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy, evidence of bad faith registration and use include without limitation:

- (i) circumstances indicating the disputed domain name was registered or acquired primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the disputed domain name registration to the owner of a trademark or to a competitor of the trademark owner, for valuable consideration in excess of the documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name; or
- (ii) circumstances indicating that the disputed domain name was registered in order to prevent the owner of a trademark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding disputed domain name, provided there is a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) circumstances indicating that the disputed domain name was registered primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) circumstances indicating that the disputed domain name has intentionally been used in an attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or location or of a product or service on that website or location.

The Complainant's YLE trademark registration predates the registration of the disputed domain name. Considering the Complainant's long and extensive history and the distinctiveness of the YLE trademark, which is well-known in Finland, the Panel finds it unlikely that the Respondent did not have the Complainant in mind when registering and using the disputed domain name. This is further emphasized by the content of the Respondent's website to which the disputed domain name resolves. As mentioned above, the Respondent's website, reproduces the Complainant's trademark in combination with national news in Finnish.

Thus, the evidence in the case before the Panel indicates that the disputed domain name has intentionally been used in an attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or location or of a product or service on that website or location.

The Respondent did not submit any evidence in the case that refutes the Complainant's submissions.

The Panel concludes that the Complainant has proved the requirements under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy and that the disputed domain name <yleuutiset.com> has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 <yleuutiset.com> shall be transferred to the Complainant.

/Johan Sjöbeck/

Johan Sjöbeck

Sole Panelist

Date: August 26, 2025