

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Archer-Daniels-Midland Company (ADM) v. Archer Daniels, Archer DAniels Midlands

Case No. D2025-3805

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Archer Daniels, Archer DAniels Midlands, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <admnutris.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 18, 2025. On September 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 23, 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 (Domain Admin) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 23, 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 amended Complaint on September 23, 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 September 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 14, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 22, 2025.

The Center appointed Ik-Hyun Seo as the sole panelist in this matter on October 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 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 Respondent appears to be an individual with an address in the United States.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 31, 2025, and resolves to the landing page for the registrar. The disputed domain name has been used to send fraudulent emails impersonating the Complainant.

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 is confusingly similar to the mark in which the Complainant has rights since the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's ADM mark, and the ADM portion is the most prominent and recognizable portion of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and confirms that it has not authorized or licensed rights to the Respondent in any respect. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent generated an email address "...@admnutris.com" from the disputed domain name and sent an email purporting to be from the Complainant and offering to sell cooking oil which is one of the goods of the Complainant. The email was signed under a fictitious name while the signature block included the Complainant's name, registered trademark logo, address of the Complainant's North American headquarters, and links to the Complainant's websites. The Complainant contends that such use is a fraudulent act intended to deceive the recipient, as well as to exploit and tarnish the reputation and credibility of the Complainant's name and brand in furtherance of illicit schemes.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith. First, the Complainant contends that given the fame of the Complainant's mark as well as the manner of use of the disputed domain name, there can be no other conclusion that the Respondent not only used the disputed domain name in bad faith but registered it in bad faith as well.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not 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 ADM 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 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.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity - here, claimed phishing and impersonation/passing off – can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1. The Panel considers that the Respondent's name "Archer Daniels, Archer DAniels Midlands" does not confer any rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent under the circumstances of this case.

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 the disputed domain name and used it to send an email to a third party impersonating the Complainant, very likely in order to commit fraud. 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 name constitute bad faith under the Policy.

Further, given the way in which the disputed domain name was used, it is clear that the Respondent targeted the Complainant and its mark when registering the disputed domain name.

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 <admnutris.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ik-Hyun Seo/

Ik-Hyun Seo

Sole Panelist

Date: November 11, 2025