

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Alfa Laval Corporate AB v. Babich Igor
Case No. D2025-4180

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Alfa Laval Corporate AB, Sweden, represented by Advokatbyrå Gulliksson AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Babich Igor, the Russian Federation.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <alfa-laval.pro> is registered with RU-CENTER-MSK (Regional Network Information Center, JSC dba RU-CENTER) (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 14, 2025. On October 15, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 17, 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 and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 20, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint.

On October 20, 2025, the Center informed the parties in Russian and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is Russian. On October 21, 2025, the Complainant filed an amended Complaint confirming its request that English be the language of the proceedings. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission.

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 Levan Nanobashvili as the sole panelist in this matter on November 19, 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

Established in Sweden in 1883, the Complainant operates globally in the technology areas of heat transfer, separation, and gas and fluid handling. The Complainant's initial company name, AB Separator, was changed to Alfa-Laval AB in 1963.

The Complainant filed its first trademark application for ALFA LAVAL in Sweden in 1897. The Complainant has extensively used ALFA LAVAL trademark, and this mark is well known in the respective business sector. Currently, the Complainant owns more than two hundred trademarks worldwide for ALFA LAVAL, including the following:

- 1) the United States of America registration No. 0764251, registered on February 4, 1964, duly renewed, in International Classes 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 16, 21, and 28;
- 2) the European Union trademark registration (figurative) No. 018170847, registered on June 24, 2020, in International Classes 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 17, 22, 28, 37, and 42; and
- 3) the Russian Federation registration No. 207574, registered on December 26, 2001, duly renewed, in International Classes 1, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, and 37.

The Complainant owns multiple domain names incorporating the ALFA LAVAL mark under different Top-Level Domains ("TLDs"), including ".com", ".us", and ".uk".

The disputed domain name was registered on March 14, 2024. At the time of the Decision, the disputed domain name is not active. However, the case file demonstrates that, following registration, the disputed domain name resolved to an active website displaying the Complainant's trademark and logo, and offering its products and 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:

- (i) it has extensively used the ALFA LAVAL trademark for more than a century. ALFA LAVAL is one of the most famous and well known trademarks in the respective business sector;
- (ii) ALFA LAVAL trademark is well known in Sweden. In a market survey conducted in 2014, 90% of the respondents recognized ALFA LAVAL trademark and 56% of the respondents associated this trademark with certain products of the Complainant. More than half of the respondents (59%) stated that they had first heard the term "ALFA LAVAL" at least 30 years prior to the survey;

(iii) the Respondent has incorporated the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain name in its entirety. The generic TLD ("gTLD") ".pro" should be disregarded in the disputed domain name, as well as the hyphen;

(iv) there is no affiliation or authorization between the Complainant and the Respondent. Consequently, the Respondent unlawfully uses the Complainant's trademark and website content to offer the Complainant's products and services, thereby misleading consumers into believing that the website is operated by the Complainant. The Respondent clearly intends to capitalize on the goodwill associated with the Complainant. Such conduct may confuse customers, causing them to believe that there is a legitimate connection between the Complainant and the Respondent;

(v) the Respondent does not own any trademarks or applications for the "ALFA LAVAL" term. There is no evidence that the Respondent is a bona fide actor intending to use the disputed domain name for any legitimate purposes. Moreover, the Respondent cannot conduct any activities under the "ALFA LAVAL" term without infringing the Complainant's trademarks; and

(vi) the disputed domain name should be considered to have been registered and used in bad faith. The Respondent clearly had the Complainant's trademark in mind when registering the disputed domain name, since the Respondent uses the Complainant's trademark and the website content in an infringing way.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Language of the Proceedings

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Russian. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceedings shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceedings be English, claiming that translation of the documents would cause undue delay, expense, and inconvenience. The Respondent did not make any submissions with respect to the language of the proceedings.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceedings shall be English. The Panel notes that the Respondent has filed no response. Had the response been filed in either Russian or English, the Panel would have been able to consider it.

B. 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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the ALFA LAVAL trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the 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 presence of a hyphen is of negligible significance when assessing confusing similarity (*Aldi GmbH & Co. KG, Aldi Stores Limited v. Nanci Nette*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1830](#); and *Taylor Wessing Limited Liability Partnership v. Marcus Mekterovic*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-4728](#)). Moreover, the addition of the gTLD “.pro” is a standard registration requirements and, as such, is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

C. 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.

The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s contention that it has not authorized the Respondent to use the ALFA LAVAL mark, or that there is no relationship between them that would justify the Respondent’s registration and use of the Complainant’s trademark in the disputed domain name.

At the time of the Decision, the disputed domain name is not active. However, the case file demonstrates that, following registration, the disputed domain name resolved to an active website displaying the Complainant’s trademark and logo, and offering its products and services.

According to a consensus view among UDRP panels, resellers or service providers using a domain name containing a complainant’s trademark to undertake sales or repairs related to the complainant’s goods or services may be making a bona fide offering of goods or services and thus have a legitimate interest in such domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.8.1. Outlined in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#) (the “Oki Data Test”), the following cumulative requirements will be applied in the specific conditions of a UDRP case:

- (i) the respondent must actually be offering the goods or services at issue;
- (ii) the respondent must use the site to sell only the trademarked goods or services;
- (iii) the site must accurately and prominently disclose the registrant’s relationship with trademark holder; and
- (iv) the respondent must not try to “corner the market” in domain names reflecting trademark.

The Panel finds that the Respondent fails to satisfy at least the third requirement of the Oki Data Test. The evidence on file does not show any disclaimer on the Respondent's website. Absence of the disclaimer on the website displaying the Complainant's mark and logo, and offering its products may confuse consumers into believing the site was the official outlet or an authorized partner. The Panel finds accordingly that the requirements of the Oki Data Test are not satisfied in the present case.

The Panel finds that the use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent which may create confusion with the Complainant, does not confer rights or legitimate interests.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

D. 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.

Under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, the use of a disputed domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of a website or location or of a product or service on the website or location, amounts to evidence of registration and use in bad faith.

The Panel notes that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark. As demonstrated by the evidence on file, following registration, the disputed domain name resolved to an active website displaying the Complainant's trademark and logo, and offering its products and services.

The Respondent failed to rebut the Complainant's assertion that it had not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use the ALFA LAVAL mark.

Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

A significant number of panels have consistently found that the Complainant's ALFA LAVAL trademark is well known worldwide (*Alfa Laval Corporate AB v. Linda Krauz*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-1873](#); *Alfa Laval Corporate AB v. Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf / holy genius*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-2492](#); *Alfa Laval Corporate AB v. Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf / nicholas friend, JDC worcetsr associates*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1494](#); and *Alfa Laval Corporate AB v. Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0148561631 / Erin Dickey, EDickey Ltd*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-1617](#)).

The Panel finds that the Complainant's trademark registrations significantly predate the registration date of the disputed domain name. The evidence before the Panel demonstrates that the Complainant has been doing business using the ALFA LAVAL trademark for more than a century, and the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in 2024. A significant gap, in the present case more than a century and a quarter, between registration of the Complainant's trademark and Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name containing the trademark at issue can indicate the bad faith registration (*Hi-TEC Sports International Holdings B.V. v. Thomas Birch, Finlay Nolan, Anna Akhtar, Tyler Reynolds, Keira Donnelly*, [WIPO Case No. D2024-1891](#)).

At the time of the Decision, the disputed domain name is not active. However, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition and prior use of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of 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 <alfa-laval.pro> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Levan Nanobashvili/

Levan Nanobashvili

Sole Panelist

Date: November 27, 2025