

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Swedish Match North Europe, Philip Morris International, Inc. v. lin wang,  
hippo

Case No. D2025-3003

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainants are Swedish Match North Europe, Sweden, and Philip Morris International, Inc., United States of America, represented by D.M. Kisch Inc., South Africa.

The Respondent is lin wang, hippo, Malaysia.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <zynnicotine.com> is registered with Atak Domain Hosting Internet ve Bilgi Teknolojileri Limited Sirketi d/b/a Atak Teknoloji (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 28, 2025. On July 29, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 30, 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 (Atak Domain) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on July 30, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint on August 2, 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 August 6, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 26, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 2, 2025.

The Center appointed Tobias Zuberbühler as the sole panelist in this matter on September 9, 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**

Founded in 1992, the Complainant Swedish Match North Europe is primarily engaged in the business of manufacturing, marketing and selling smoke free tobacco products, such as snus and nicotine pouches, which are sold in several countries.

The Complainant Swedish Match North Europe is a company which is part of the group of companies affiliated to the other Complainant, Philip Morris International Inc. In May 2022, Swedish Match North Europe was acquired by Philip Morris International Inc. Therefore, the Panel will refer to the Complainants jointly as “the Complainant” within the remainder of this Decision.

The Complainant owns various trademark registrations, including the International Trademark ZYN (No. 1421212; registered on April 18, 2018).

The disputed domain name was registered on July 2, 2025, and, at the time of filing the Complaint, was linked to an online shop displaying the Complainant's logo and allegedly selling and offering the Complainant's products, as well as promoting competing third party products of other commercial origin.

#### **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.

##### **B. Respondent**

The Respondent has not submitted any 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 a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Complainant's trademark 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 addition of other terms (here the descriptive term “nicotine”) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing

similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel finds that 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 that 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 in substance and has not come forward with any evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise. The Panel also notes that the composition of the disputed domain name creates a risk of implied affiliation.

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.

Under the circumstances of this case, it is clear that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

The evidence and allegations submitted by the Complainant support the finding that the Respondent was engaged in an attempt to attract Internet users to its website for its own commercial gain. The Respondent therefore used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has also 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 <zynnicotine.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Tobias Zuberbühler/*

**Tobias Zuberbühler**

Sole Panelist

Date: September 22, 2025