

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Archer-Daniels-Midland Company v. Laurent Walker, HelliOS
Case No. D2025-3084

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Archer-Daniels-Midland Company, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Innis Law Group LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Laurent Walker, HelliOS, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <adm-global.site> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 2, 2025. On August 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 4, 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 ("Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf") and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 5, 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 August 5, 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 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 Parties of the Respondent's default on August 27, 2025.

The Center appointed Ingrida Kariņa-Bērziņa as the sole panelist in this matter on September 5, 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 was established in Chicago, United States as an agribusiness in 1902 and is commonly known by the abbreviation “ADM”. It now operates a global business in various sectors, including financial services through a subsidiary known as ADM Investment Services Inc. It is the proprietor of a number of trademark registrations in several countries, including the following:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 1386430 for ADM (word mark), registered on March 18, 1986 for goods and services in classes 1, 4, 12, 16, 29, 30, 31, and 39, claiming a date of first use in 1923;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 2766613 for ADM (word mark), registered on September 23, 2003 for goods and services in classes 16, 35, 36 (including “financial and investment services”) and 42.

The Complainant operates its primary business website at the domain name <adm.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 16, 2025. The Complaint indicates that it was used to resolve to a website purporting to offer investment services under the heading “Join ADM and watch out for you (sic) financial growth”. It currently resolves to a page stating that the site cannot be reached.

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 the disputed domain name reflects the well-known ADM mark in its entirety. The mark has become well-known through extensive use and promotion for more than a century; the Complainant today operates in 200 countries worldwide. The addition of the term “global” does not reduce the confusing similarity. The Respondent is not authorized by the Complainant to use its mark and is not making any legitimate non-commercial use of the disputed domain name. Rather, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to promote an illegitimate money-making scheme. On the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, Internet visitors are invited to submit personal data. The Complainant notes that its ADM mark has been targeted by numerous fraudulent schemes, which have been the subject of a number of UDRP proceedings in which the Complainant has been successful.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the UDRP requires the Complainant to make out all three of the following:

- (i) the disputed 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 disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Under paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, “[a] Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable”.

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 entirety of the 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 addition of other terms (here, “global”) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such a 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 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 name. 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 notes the composition of the disputed domain name, which consists of the Complainant's ADM mark together with the descriptive term "global". Therefore, the Panel finds that the nature of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation to the Complainant that cannot constitute fair use. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor that there are any circumstances or activities that would establish the Respondent's rights therein. Rather, the disputed domain name resolved to a website displaying the Complainant's ADM mark and inviting Internet users to submit their personal information to purportedly receive financial services. Under these circumstances, such use does not represent a bona fide offering of goods or services. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes 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. The disputed domain name comprises the Complainant's ADM mark together with a descriptive term. The Complainant has used its ADM mark for more than a century prior to the registration of the disputed domain name. Under these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

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.

The Panel finds that, under these circumstances, the use of the disputed domain name to resolve to a website displaying the Complainant's ADM mark and inviting Internet users to submit their personal data is an indication of bad faith use of the disputed domain name. The statement on the Respondent's website promising "financial growth" in proximity to the Complainant's mark is indicative of a likely fraudulent scheme. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.5.

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 <adm-global.site> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa/

Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa

Sole Panelist

Date: September 19, 2025