

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Archer-Daniels-Midland Company v. Terry A Dunlap, Terry Dunlap
Case No. D2025-3923

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 Terry A Dunlap, Terry Dunlap, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <adml.bar>, <adml.help>, <admm.click>, <admm.club>, <adm1.blog>, and <adm1.onl> 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 September 25, 2025. On September 26, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On September 30, 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/Redacted for privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 30, 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 30, 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 October 6, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 26, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 29, 2025.

The Center appointed Elizabeth Ann Morgan 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 premier agribusinesses. In 2023, worldwide net sales at ADM were USD 93 billion.

This Complaint is based on ADM's numerous 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 ADM maintains. ADM owns numerous trademark registrations for the ADM Mark in the United States for a wide range of goods and services. Due to its promotion and continued global use of its name and brands, ADM has built up international goodwill and reliability in the ADM Mark among its consumers, wherein the ADM Mark is now well known and famous.

Since March 18, 1986, ADM (Registration No. 1386430) has been registered in the United States for the following goods and services with a first use date at least as early as 1923: Class 1, Chemicals for industrial use, namely, ethyl alcohol; ground corn cobs for use in further manufacture; Class 4, Industrial oils for use in chemicals and paints made from cottonseeds, sunflower seeds, soybeans, flaxseeds, corn germ and fish; Class 12, Barges, vans and railway cars; Class 16, House organs; Class 29, Processed foods, namely, prepared entrees, namely, textured vegetable protein used as a substitute for meat, cheese, fish and poultry; food oils made from cotton seed; edible sunflower seeds; processed soybeans; edible fish oils; edible flaxseeds; partially finished oils for use by other manufacturers; Class 30, Staple foods, namely, processed corn, corn germ, corn syrups, flour, corn starch, cornmeal, grits, spaghetti, sugar, noodles and macaroni; Class 31, Natural agricultural products, namely, raw peanuts, unprocessed malt, dog and cat food, livestock and poultry feed, unprocessed oats, unprocessed barely, unprocessed corn, unprocessed wheat, unprocessed soybeans, unprocessed flaxseeds, and unprocessed sunflower seeds; and Class 39, Transportation of agricultural products by truck, barge and rail and storage of agricultural products.

ADM also owns other United States registrations for the ADM Mark, including Registration No. 2766613, registered on September 23, 2003, for the following goods and services: Class 16, Printed materials, namely, newsletters, bulletins, brochures, pamphlets, leaflets, reference calendars and manuals, trade journals and trade reports all in the field of financial, investment and commodities trading; Class 35, Market research services and back office support services related to the investment industry; Class 36, Financial and investment services, namely, providing financial information on the Internet; financial clearing house services; financial research; brokerage house services in the field of stocks, commodities and futures; financial advisory and consulting services; trading in securities, options, commodities and futures; providing online financial services in the nature of stock, bond and mutual fund investing via a global computer network; and Class 42, Providing temporary use of online non-downloadable software for use in portfolio management, accessing account information and for use in the secure download of trading and cash related information in the commodities exchange industry.

ADM also owns numerous additional worldwide registrations that cover a wide range of goods and services.

The Complainant submitted this Complaint after receiving reports of the Respondent's fraudulent activities, including hosting fraudulent websites encouraging unsuspecting victims to give personal information as part of what appears to be a fraudulent investment scheme. The Respondent has registered at least six domain names including <adml.bar>, <adml.help>, <admm.click>, <admm.club>, <adm1.blog>, and <adm1.onl>, all registered on September 15, 2025. Each of the disputed domain names hosts a fraudulent webpage with a copyright notice "ADM © 2025" that uses the signature leaf portion of ADM's registered trademark logo and appears to be aiming to collect personal data from individuals by having them register for the site. Additionally, <adm1.onl> and <adml.bar> have been included in several social media posts that appear to promote the fraudulent investment scheme.

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 given the fame of the ADM Mark, ADM's extensive online presence, and the use of "adm" in the disputed domain names, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the ADM Mark. The "1" in <adm1.blog> and <adm1.onl>; the "l" in <adml.bar> and <adml.help>; and the "m" in <admm.click> and <admm.club> cannot negate the confusing similarity with the ADM Mark. With regards to similarity, the disputed domain names and the ADM Mark are also similar in meaning or connotation. They consist of the same three letters, "adm", in the same order with no punctuation. ADM will be perceived by most consumers as an acronym and trademark for the Complainant, given the renown of the mark. Since the only difference is the inclusion of "1", "l", or "m" which, are likely to go undetected, the disputed domain names and the ADM Mark should be treated as conceptually identical. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names and the Respondent should be considered to be operating in bad faith given the allegedly fraudulent schemes and efforts to profit off of confusion with the Complainant's ADM Mark.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 as is the case here.

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 Panel finds that the ADM 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. Although the addition of other terms here, “1”, “l”, or “m”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names 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 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity, here the use of the disputed domain names <adm1.onl> and <adml.bar> in a fraudulent investment scheme, 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 Panel notes that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain names for purposes of intentionally creating confusion with the Complainant’s ADM Mark with the aim possibly for collecting personal data through asking for credentials to access the websites at the disputed domain name and for its financial benefit.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity, here the use of the disputed domain names <adm1.onl> and <adml.bar> in connection with a fraudulent investment scheme 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 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 names <adml.bar>, <adml.help>, <admm.click>, <admm.club>, <adm1.blog>, and <adm1.onl> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Elizabeth Ann Morgan/

Elizabeth Ann Morgan

Sole Panelist

Date: November 14, 2025