

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Inriver AB v. Name Redacted

Case No. D2025-4013

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Inriver AB, Sweden, represented by Hansson Thyresson AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Name Redacted.<sup>1</sup>

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <premiuminriver.top> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 1, 2025. On October 1, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 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 (Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 6, 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 October 6, 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”).

---

<sup>1</sup>The Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent’s name from this decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST- 12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on October 9, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 29, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. A third party apparently in receipt of the Center's written notice of the proceeding sent an email communication to the Center on October 13, 2025, claiming identity theft. On November 5, 2025, the Center informed the Parties that it would proceed with panel appointment.

The Center appointed Vincent Denoyelle as the sole panelist in this matter on November 12, 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 a software company specialized in product information management (PIM) solutions.

The Complainant is the owner of several INRIVER trade marks including the following:

- European Union Trade Mark INRIVER n° 017290231 registered on January 19, 2018; and
- European Union Trade Mark INRIVER n° 018125481 registered on January 30, 2020.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 12, 2025, and it points to a website displaying the INRIVER trade mark and replicating visual elements from the Complainant's official homepage while offering similar services.

#### **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 its INRIVER trade mark, as it wholly incorporates it with the mere addition of the descriptive term "premium," which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent does not own any relevant trade mark rights. The Complainant further states that it has not granted any license or authorization to the Respondent for any use of its INRIVER trade mark. The Complainant argues that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to reproduce the Complainant's branding, layout, and commercial offering demonstrates that the Respondent is attempting to impersonate the Complainant and to create confusion among users which cannot be considered as being consistent with a legitimate interest.

With respect to bad faith, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's INRIVER trade mark, given the longstanding use of the INRIVER trade mark prior to the registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the intent to disrupt the Complainant's business and to exploit its trade mark for commercial gain and that this demonstrates a deliberate attempt to capitalize on the Complainant's reputation and goodwill.

##### **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 trade mark 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 trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the INRIVER trade mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the INRIVER trade mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "premium", 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 Complainant has confirmed that it has not licensed or authorized the Respondent to use its INRIVER trade mark. There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor that it has made use of it in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The evidence shows that the disputed domain name is used for a website fraudulently impersonating the Complainant, reproducing its INRIVER trade mark, visual identity, and commercial content relating to its PIM software solutions.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, fraudulent impersonation 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 finds that the Respondent, at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, must have been aware of the Complainant's trade mark INRIVER reproduced in the disputed domain name given (i) the reputation of the INRIVER trade mark and (ii) the fact that the disputed domain name was registered relatively recently and many years after the registration of the trade mark INRIVER.

Turning to use in bad faith, the Panel notes that the website associated with the disputed domain name shows that the Respondent is seeking to fraudulently impersonate the Complainant and to deliberately mislead unsuspecting Internet users. The Panel further notes that it seems more likely than not that the Respondent used the contact details of a third party when registering the disputed domain name. Such identity theft is further evidence of registration and use in bad faith.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, fraudulent impersonation, 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 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 <premiuminriver.top> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Vincent Denoyelle/*

**Vincent Denoyelle**

Sole Panelist

Date: November 26, 2025