

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Tetra Laval Holdings & Finance S.A. v. Diana Guzman  
Case No. D2025-4163

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Tetra Laval Holdings & Finance S.A., Switzerland, represented by Aera A/S, Denmark.

The Respondent is Diana Guzman, Germany.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <tetraipak.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 October 10, 2025. On October 13, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 14, 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, Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 16, 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 October 21, 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 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 13, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 14, 2025.

The Center appointed Beatrice Onica Jarka as the sole panelist in this matter on November 22, 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 Swiss corporation which is a part of the Tetra Laval Group consisting of three independent industry groups including the Tetra Pak Group. The Tetra Pak Group is a multinational food processing and packaging company founded in 1947 in Sweden by Ruben Rausing. The Tetra Pak Group develops, markets and sells equipment for processing, packaging, and distribution of food products. The Tetra Pak Group is world leading within development, production, and sale of equipment and processing plants for making, packaging, and distributing foods and accessories. The Tetra Pak Group employs more than 25,000 people and is operative in more than 160 countries worldwide.

The Complainant owns the TETRA PAK trademark, which is registered, both as word marks as well as part of device marks, in more than 160 countries throughout the world with more than 1,500 registrations, hereunder, but not limited to:

- Swedish Trademark Registration No. 71196 TETRA PAK, registered in 1951,
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 1202522 TETRA PAK, registered in 2000,
- United States of America ("US") trademark registration No. 586,480 TETRA PAK, registered in 1954, and
- US trademark registration No. 580,219 TETRA PAK, registered in 1953. Attached as Annex D to the Complaint is copies of selected trademark certificates as well as a list of trademark registrations worldwide for the trademark TETRA PAK as Annex E to the Complaint.

The Complainant is the owner of more than 300 domain name registrations throughout the world containing the TETRA PAK mark distributed among generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") and country code Top-Level Domains ("ccTLDs"). Attached as Annex F to the Complaint is a list of domain name registrations containing the TETRA PAK mark owned by the Complainant or its licensees.

From the record, the Respondent appears to be an individual who registered the disputed domain name on September 25, 2025, and the disputed domain name has been used to send fraudulent emails to the Complainant's supplier.

#### **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 <tetraipak.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark TETRA PAK as the disputed domain name is a deliberate misspelling of the well-known trademark.
- The disputed domain name is a classic typosquatting case, which comprises a plausible way that an Internet user might accidentally mistype the word "tetrapak" into a web browser when seeking information about the Complainant.
- The Respondent has no rights to or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name based on the Complainant's continuous and long prior use of its trademark TETRA PAK.
- The Respondent is not affiliated or related to the Complainant in any way or licensed or otherwise authorized to use the TETRA PAK mark in connection with a website or for any other purpose.

- The Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services, is not generally known by the disputed domain name and has not acquired any trademark or service mark rights in that name or mark.
- The Respondent cannot have been ignorant of the rights held by the Complainant and its business.
- The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant's employees in connection with email phishing directed to the Complainant's supplier in Mexico for the purpose of banking information.
- Considering the brand awareness of the trademark TETRA PAK worldwide, an Internet user or an email recipient would most probably assume a connection with or endorsement from the Complainant and its business when seeking information on a website at the disputed domain name <tetraipak.com> or receiving an email with the address "[...][@tetraipak.com](mailto:[...]@tetraipak.com)" by hijacking personal information belonging to an employee of the Complainant.
- The Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its distinctive and unique TETRA PAK trademark and targeted that trademark when registering the disputed domain name.
- The Complainant's trademark TETRA PAK is strong and distinctive. It is evident that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name based on the goodwill and reputation of the Complainant's mark, in order to conduct phishing activity.
- The Respondent's primary motive in relation to the registration and use of the disputed domain name is to capitalize on or otherwise take advantage of the Complainant's known trademark rights for scam activity.

## **B. Respondent**

Despite being procedurally summoned, 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 definitely 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 appears to be a typosquatting case, as it comprises the Complainant's trademark misspelled in a plausible way that an Internet user might accidentally mistype the word "tetrapak" as "tetraipak" into a web browser when seeking information about the Complainant.

According to section 1.9 of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) "[a] domain name which consists of a common, obvious or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element".

Additionally, the gTLD has no legal significance and may be disregarded according to [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), paragraph 1.11.

As the Complainant's TETRA PAK mark is recognizable in the disputed domain name, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the TETRA PAK mark in which the Complainant has rights.

Consequently, 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.

From the available record, the Respondent appears not to be affiliated or related to the Complainant in any way or licensed or otherwise authorized to use the TETRA PAK mark in connection with a website or for any other purpose. Moreover, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant’s employees in connection with email phishing directed to the Complainant’s supplier for the purpose of banking information.

Considering the brand awareness of the trademark TETRA PAK worldwide, an Internet user or an email recipient would most probably assume a connection with or endorsement from the Complainant and its business when receiving an email with the address “[...]@tetraipak.com” by hijacking personal information belonging to an employee of the Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed phishing, impersonation/passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Consequently, 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 appears to use the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant’s employees in connection with email phishing directed to the Complainant’s supplier for the purpose of banking information.

Considering the typosquatting found for the first element of the Policy jointly with the illegitimate use of the Complainant’s trademark, the Panel finds that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its distinctive and unique TETRA PAK trademark and targeted that trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

The Panel is persuaded that the Complainant's trademark TETRA PAK is strong and distinctive and that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name based on the goodwill and reputation of the Complainant's mark, in order to conduct phishing activity or otherwise take advantage of the Complainant's known trademark rights for scam activity.

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 phishing, impersonation/passing off, 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.

Consequently, 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 <tetraipak.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Dr. Beatrice Onica Jarka/*

**Dr. Beatrice Onica Jarka**

Sole Panelist

Date: December 5, 2025