

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Icehotel Aktiebolag v. Veline Go, Alexis Group
Case No. D2025-4030

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Icehotel Aktiebolag, Sweden, represented by Zacco Sweden AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Veline Go, Alexis Group, Cambodia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <icebarstockholm.com> is 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 October 2, 2025. On October 3, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 6, 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 (HIDDEN DETAILS) 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”).

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. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 31, 2025.

The Center appointed Torsten Bettinger as the sole panelist in this matter on November 6, 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 the owner and operator of the ICEHOTEL in Jukkasjärvi, a unique hotel and art exhibition constructed from natural ice and snow from the Torne River. Through a strategic partnership with Absolut Vodka in the 1990s, the brand gained international recognition, leading to the opening of the first permanent ICEBAR in Stockholm in 2002 in cooperation with Hotel C, which remains the flagship venue and attracts around 100,000 visitors annually.

Since then, the ICEBAR concept has been exported to major cities worldwide, including London, Tokyo, Milan, Shanghai, Oslo and Copenhagen, primarily as successful pop-up venues. All ICEBAR locations share the same core features: a constant interior temperature of approximately –5°C, guests equipped with thermal capes and gloves, and drinks served in glasses carved entirely from Torne River ice produced in Jukkasjärvi and shipped to each location.

The Complainant owns multiple ICEBAR, ICEBAR BY ICEHOTEL and ICEBAR BY ICEHOTEL (figurative) trademarks covering a broad variety of goods, including drinking vessels and containers, ice rooms, building constructions made of ice, and services such as providing food and drink in cooled rooms, including for example:

- International trademark registration no. 795785 ICEBAR, registered on December 3, 2002 designating Switzerland, Iceland, Norway and the Russian Federation;
- International trademark registration No. 1711031, ICEBAR by ICEHOTEL, registered on September 5, 2022 designating Canada and the United Arab Emirates;
- European Union trademark registration No. 002958072 ICEBAR, registered on November 12, 2004;
- European Union trademark registration No. 017538001 ICEBAR by ICEHOTEL, registered on March 26, 2018.

The Complainant also is the owner of, *inter alia* the domain names, <icebarstockholm.se>, <icebarcopenhagen.com>, <icebar.com>, and <icebar.se>.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 4, 2025 and resolves to a website that mimics the Complainant's own site, reproducing the Complainant's logo, name, design, and corporate colors.

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.

With regard to the requirement of "identity or confusing similarity between the trademark and the domain name" pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Complainant submits that:

- the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its ICEBAR trademarks, as it incorporates the ICEBAR mark in its entirety;
- given that the Complainant also operates under corresponding domain names in various Nordic country-code domains (such as ".se", ".dk" and ".fi"), Internet users are likely to assume that the disputed domain name is owned by the Complainant or that there is a commercial relationship between the parties;
- the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is irrelevant for the assessment of confusing similarity;

- the Respondent is exploiting the goodwill and reputation of the ICEBAR trademarks, with a risk of dilution and other damage to the Complainant's marks.

With regard to the Respondent having no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, the Complainant submitted that:

- the Respondent is not commonly known by, nor trading under, any name corresponding to the domain name and has made no demonstrable preparations to do so;
- the disputed domain name resolves to a website that closely imitates the Complainant's official ICEBAR Stockholm website, reproducing the Complainant's logo, name, layout, colors and content, thereby falsely suggesting that the site is operated by or affiliated with the Complainant;
- the Respondent has not been licensed or otherwise authorized to use the Complainant's ICEBAR marks and is neither an authorized dealer nor a business partner;
- the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name cannot be regarded as a bona fide offering of goods or services, but rather as an attempt to divert Internet users seeking the Complainant for the Respondent's own presumed commercial benefit.

Finally, with regard to the disputed domain name having been registered and being used in bad faith, the Complainant argues that:

- that it owns registered ICEBAR, ICEBAR BY ICEHOTEL and related figurative trademarks in numerous jurisdictions, which predate the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name in June 2025;
- in view of the fame and value of the Complainant's trademarks, and the fact that the website at the disputed domain name copies the Complainant's own ICEBAR Stockholm website in terms of layout, colors and content, the Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant and its rights when registering the disputed domain name;
- the disputed domain name fully incorporates the ICEBAR mark together with the descriptive geographic term "Stockholm", corresponding to the permanent location of the Complainant's ICEBAR, which indicates that the Respondent was targeting the Complainant and acted in bad faith;
- the Respondent is intentionally using the disputed domain name to create a false impression of affiliation with, or endorsement by, the Complainant, thereby disrupting the Complainant's business;
- the website to which the disputed domain name resolves contains various links and collects visitors' personal data, presumably for commercial gain or other illicit purposes;
- such conduct constitutes use of the disputed domain name in bad faith, in that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of that website.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy states that the Complainant must prove each of the three following elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (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 disputed domain name, <icebarstockholm.com>, incorporates the ICEBAR mark in its entirety as the leading and clearly recognizable element. According to well-established UDRP practice, the mere addition of other terms to a complainant's mark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity where the mark remains readily identifiable within the domain name.

In this case, the additional term "stockholm" is a geographical term corresponding to the city where the Complainant operates its flagship ICEBAR venue.

The gTLD ".com" is a technical requirement of registration and is, in line with UDRP practice, disregarded for the purpose of assessing confusing similarity.

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

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.

The Complainant contends that it has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted to use the ICEBAR mark.

The disputed domain name wholly incorporates the ICEBAR with the additional geographical term "Stockholm" corresponding to the city where the Complainant operates its flagship ICEBAR venue.

Such composition carries a risk of implied affiliation and does not confer rights or legitimate interests. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. The addition of a non-distinctive geographic element reinforces an impression of an official or country-specific portal of the trademark owner rather than establishing any independent right of the Respondent.

On this basis, the Complainant has made a *prima facie* showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests.

On the record, the Panel also finds that there is also no evidence of a bona fide offering of goods or services before notice of the dispute (paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy). Where a domain name suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner, panels routinely find that any commercial use is not bona fide. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5).

To the extent the Respondent might claim to resell the Complainant's goods, the Oki Data principles require accurate disclosure of the relationship and other safeguards. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.8. A domain name that impersonates or suggests official status fails these criteria and does not give rise to rights or legitimate interests.

In the absence of any evidence rebutting the Complainant's *prima facie* case, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The requirement of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy is therefore satisfied.

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.

1. Bad faith registration

The record shows that the Complainant owns registered rights in the ICEBAR and ICEBAR BY ICEHOTEL trademarks, including in the European Union and other jurisdictions, predating the registration of the disputed domain name in June 2025. The disputed domain name, <icebarstockholm.com>, incorporates the ICEBAR mark in its entirety together with the geographical term "Stockholm", which corresponds to the city where the Complainant operates its flagship ICEBAR and uses the domain name <icebarstockholm.se>.

In the circumstances and given the distinctive nature of the ICEBAR mark in connection with the Complainant's concept and venue, the Panel considers it highly unlikely that the Respondent independently selected the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its trademarks. The combination of the Complainant's mark with the city name of its permanent ICEBAR location is, in the Panel's view, a clear indication that the Respondent was targeting the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name.

This conclusion is reinforced by the subsequent use of the disputed domain name for a website that closely imitates the Complainant's official ICEBAR Stockholm website in terms of logo, design, colors and content. On the balance of probabilities, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, with the intention of taking unfair advantage of the reputation and goodwill attaching to the Complainant's ICEBAR mark.

2. Bad Faith Use

The evidence further shows that the disputed domain name resolves to a website that creates a false impression of being operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant. The site reproduces the Complainant's logotype, name, design, corporate colors and similar content to that found on the Complainant's ICEBAR Stockholm webpage, without any disclaimer or explanation of the Respondent's lack of relationship with the Complainant. The website also contains various links and collects personal data from Internet users who, on the evidence, are likely to be seeking the Complainant's genuine ICEBAR services.

Such use clearly seeks to capitalize on the Complainant's reputation and to attract Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of that website, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Even if the precise commercial or other purpose behind this imitation is not fully documented, the only reasonable inference on this record is that the Respondent is attempting to derive some form of benefit from the misrepresentation.

In line with prior UDRP decisions involving look-alike websites reproducing complainant's marks, content and get-up, the Panel concludes that the Respondent's conduct amounts to use of the disputed domain name in bad faith. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been both registered and used in bad faith for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <icebarstockholm.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Torsten Bettinger/

Torsten Bettinger

Sole Panelist

Date: November 20, 2025