

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Archer-Daniels-Midland Company v. Theresa W Chavez, Theresa Chavez, Terry A Dunlap, Terry Dunlap, and Theresa f Chavez, Theresa Chavez
Case No. D2025-3264

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 Respondents are Theresa W Chavez, Theresa Chavez, United States; Terry A Dunlap, Terry Dunlap, United States; and Theresa f Chavez, Theresa Chavez, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <adm-a.cc>, <adm-a.shop>, <adm1.bond>, <adm1.cc>, <adm1.cfd>, <adm1.click>, <adm1.help>, <adm1.me>, <adm1.qpon>, <adm1.shop>, <adm1.site>, <adm1.store>, <adm1.top>, <adm1.vip>, <adm1.xin>, <www-adm.bar>, <www-adm.cc>, <www-adm.click>, <www-adm.help>, <www-adm.qpon> and <www-adm.xin> are registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 13, 2025. On August 15, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On August 17, 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 (unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 22, 2025, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on the same day.

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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 2, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 22, 2025. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on September 23, 2025.

The Center appointed Kathryn Lee as the sole panelist in this matter on October 8, 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 an agribusiness, founded in 1902. The Complainant has used the initials ADM in connection with its business since 1923. The Complainant owns approximately 800 facilities in 200 countries, and has approximately 38,000 employees. In 2023, the Complainant's worldwide net sales were USD 93 billion. The Complainant owns a number of trademark registrations for the ADM mark, including the following trademark registrations in the United States: Trademark Registration Number 1386430 registered on March 18, 1986, Trademark Registration Number 2766613 registered on September 23, 2003, and Trademark Registration Number 2301968 registered on December 21, 1999.

The disputed domain names were registered between June 11, 2025 and August 5, 2025. The disputed domain names <adm-a.shop>, <adm1.cfd>, <adm1.click>, <adm1.help>, <adm1.qpon>, <adm1.top>, <adm1.vip> and <adm1.xin>, <adm1.shop>, <www-adm.cc>, <www-adm.qpon><adm1.me>, <adm1.site>, <www-adm.bar>, <www-adm.click>, <www-adm.help>, and <www-adm.xin> were at one point linked to webpages showing the Complainant's leaf logo and inviting Internet users to provide their phone numbers and register, and as for the disputed domain name <adm1.store>, a webpage displaying only the Complainant's leaf logo. No evidence was submitted to show that the disputed domain names <adm1.cc> and <adm1.bond> were ever linked to any webpage with content.

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the marks in which the Complainant has rights since the disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's ADM mark, and the ADM portion is the most prominent and recognizable portion of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names and confirms that it has not authorized or licensed rights to the Respondents in any respect. The Complainant further contends that the Respondents used the disputed domain names to host fraudulent webpages that use the signature leaf portion of the Complainant's trademark logo in order to collect personal data from individuals by having them register for the site. The Complainant contends that that several social media posts were made with links to disputed domain names <adm1.top> and <adm1.cfd>, encouraging individuals to "JOIN NOW". The Complainant contends that such use is not evidence of legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names by the Respondents, nor is there evidence of the Respondents' use of, or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain names in providing any bona fide offering of goods or services, or the Respondents' being commonly known by the disputed domain names.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and used in bad faith. First, the Complainant contends that the Respondents' registration of the disputed domain names is in and of itself sufficient for a finding of bad faith. The Complainant contends that the Respondents used the disputed

domain names in bad faith to attempt to deceive individuals via the fraudulent webpages, and that these facts alone are sufficient to establish bad faith.

B. Respondents

The Respondents did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names can be categorized into four groups based on the registrant name/contact details as follows:

- Group 1: Disputed domain names <adm-a.cc>, <adm-a.shop>, <adm1.cc>, <adm1.cfd>, <adm1.click>, <adm1.help>, <adm1.qpon>, <adm1.top>, <adm1.vip> and <adm1.xin> are registered to Theresa W Chavez, Theresa Chavez with an address in Arizona, United States;
- Group 2: Disputed domain names <adm1.shop>, <adm1.store>, <www-adm.cc>, and <www-adm.qpon> are registered to Theresa W Chavez, Theresa Chavez with an address in Oklahoma, United States;
- Group 3: Disputed domain names <adm1.bond>, <adm1.me>, <adm1.site>, <www-adm.bar>, <www-adm.click> and <www-adm.help> are registered to Terry A Dunlap, Terry Dunlap with an address in Oregon, United States; and
- Group 4: Disputed domain name <www-adm.xin> is registered to Theresa f Chavez, Theresa Chavez with an address in Ohio, United States.

Nonetheless, the Panel is of the opinion that all 21 disputed domain names are subject to common control.

For one, all 21 disputed domain names were registered within a span of eight weeks, and are held by the same Registrar. Further, the disputed domain names in Group 1, Group 2, and Group 4 are all registered to a person named Teresa Chavez with the same phone number. In addition, 18 of the disputed domain names in all four groups were at one point linked to webpages showing the same exact content. Plus, the disputed domain names have the same naming pattern across the four groups: "adm" or "adm1" on its own or combined with "www" or letter "a".

For the reasons above, the Panel is of the view that all 21 disputed domain names are controlled by the same Respondent.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as “the Respondent”) in a single proceeding.

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 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 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 Respondent linked 18 of the disputed domain names to webpages displaying the Complainant’s logo and asking Internet users to register and provide their telephone numbers. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity – here, claimed impersonation/passing off, and possible phishing – can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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 Respondent registered 21 domain names, all incorporating the Complainant's ADM mark, and linked 19 of them to webpages showing the Complainant's leaf design mark. The number of domain names registered and the manner of use suggest that the Respondent targeted the Complainant and its mark in registering the disputed domain names.

Aside from the use of the Complainant's leaf mark, the webpages also displayed greenery in the background which is suggestive of the Complainant's agribusiness, and indicates the Respondent's attempt to pass the webpages off as associated with or operated by the Complainant. Further, the webpages asked Internet users to register and provide their telephone numbers, which appears to be an attempted phishing for personal information. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity – here, claimed impersonation/passing off and possible phishing – constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitute bad faith under the Policy.

As for the disputed domain names <adm1.cc> and <adm1.bond>, there is no evidence that they were ever connected to any active website. However, Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the failure of the Respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use, the Respondent's concealing its identity, the composition of the disputed domain names, and the implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain names may be put, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

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 names <adm-a.cc>, <adm-a.shop>, <adm1.bond>, <adm1.cc>, <adm1.cfd>, <adm1.click>, <adm1.help>, <adm1.me>, <adm1.qpon>, <adm1.shop>, <adm1.site>, <adm1.store>, <adm1.top>, <adm1.vip>, <adm1.xin>, <www-adm.bar>, <www-adm.cc>, <www-adm.click>, <www-adm.help>, <www-adm.qpon> and <www-adm.xin> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kathryn Lee/

Kathryn Lee

Sole Panelist

Date: October 22, 2025