

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Archer-Daniels-Midland Company v. Damilola Korede
Case No. D2025-3873

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Damilola Korede, Nigeria.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <admglobal.net> is registered with Host Africa (Pty.) Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 23, 2025. On September 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 26, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 October 1, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 21, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 22, 2025.

The Center appointed Christopher J. Pibus as the sole panelist in this matter on October 31, 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 Archer-Daniels-Midland Company is widely known by its initials as ADM. Founded in 1902, the corporation now serves 200 countries, owns more than 800 facilities worldwide, employs over 38,000 people, and has become one of the world's largest agribusinesses. In 2023, worldwide net sales were USD93 billion. Due to its promotion and continued global use of its name and brands, the Complainant has built up international goodwill and reliability in the ADM trademark among its consumers.

The Complaint is based on the Complainant's worldwide trademark registrations for its ADM trademark (the "ADM Mark"). The ADM Mark was adopted and has been continuously used in the United States since at least as early as 1923 in connection with numerous products and services. Today, the ADM Mark is largely recognizable due to the international nature of ADM's business, as well as the online presence. The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for the ADM Mark in the United States for a wide range of goods and services. For example, since 1986, ADM (Registration No. 1386430) has been registered in the United States for the following classes of goods and services with a first use date at least as early as 1923: Class 01, Class 04, Class 12, Class 16, Class 29, Class 30, Class 31, Class 33 and Class 39.

The Complainant maintains its global presence online, via its various websites. The Complainant has an extensive presence online through its main website, "www.adm.com" website, which allows consumers access to its history, and to descriptions of its array of products and services. The "www.adm.com" website and domain is an integral part of ADM's business as it allows consumers and business associates from around the world to learn about and communicate with the Complainant.

The Complainant has received reports of the Respondent's fraudulent activities, including creating a fraudulent website impersonating the Complainant and promoting related goods and services. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on August 11, 2025, and subsequently created a full website featuring the ADM trademarks and branding along with at least five email addresses associated with the disputed domain name. The Respondent's website prominently uses the Complainant's registered trademark logo. The website promotes animal nutrition solutions, supply chain management, sustainability, and market innovation which are the same or similar to legitimate offerings of 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 Respondent registered the <admglobal.net> domain and created a fraudulent website, solely to commit fraud and further their illicit scheme, by impersonating the ADM business. These actions clearly indicate the Respondent's intentional and bad faith attempts to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's famous ADM Marks and trade off the goodwill associated with its ADM Marks and ADM.COM domain. The Complainant seeks a finding of bad faith and an order transferring the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed, the Complainant must establish each of the following elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) 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 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 evidence indicates that the ADM trademark is recognized as a famous mark, supported by enforcement measures around the world.

The entirety of the ADM 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.

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.

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 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 is not making a legitimate, noncommercial or fair use of the <admglobal.net> domain name without intent for

commercial gain. Instead, as described above, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to deceive third parties, by hosting a copycat fraudulent website including ADM trademarks, photos, and information. The fake website has pages for “Home”, “About”, “Services”, “Blog”, and “Contact” which contain similar or identical information to the Complainant’s, including information about human and animal nutrition products and agricultural services, which are a large part of ADM’s business. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing of targeted impersonation 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 illegitimate activity here, claimed impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud, 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.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

The evidence clearly demonstrates that the Respondent has created a flagrantly fraudulent website associated with the disputed domain name, replete with ADM trademarks and branding. The “Home” page states that “Founded in Chicago, ADM has become a global leader in agricultural supply chain management, serving diverse customers across six continents” and displays fake customer reviews, including one from “John Doe”, and also displays the names of fake employees. The “Contact” page has information about fake offices in Chicago, Paris, and London, including fake email addresses with variations of [...]@admglobal.net. All these examples are strong indicia of outright fraud, intended to deceive consumers and specifically target the Complainant.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes 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 name <admglobal.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Christopher J. Pibus/

Christopher J. Pibus

Sole Panelist

Date: November 14, 2025