

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Alfa Laval Corporate AB v. emma Jansen, alfalavalf
Case No. D2025-4220

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is emma Jansen, alfalavalf, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <alfalavalf.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed 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 15, 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 (Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0176324287) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 15, 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 16, 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 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 12, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on November 13, 2025.

The Center appointed Theda König Horowicz as the sole panelist in this matter on November 21, 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 1883 in Sweden under the company name AB Separator, which was changed to Alfa-Laval AB in 1963, the Complainant, Alfa Laval Corporate AB, operates internationally in the technology areas of heat transfer, separation, and gas and fluid handling across many industries, including the marine, environment, pharma, hygienic, food, and energy sectors.

The Complainant owns numerous ALFA LAVAL trademarks, registered in many jurisdictions, including

- European Union mark No. 018170847 (figurative), registered on June 24, 2020, in International Classes 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 17, 22, 28, 37, and 42.
- United States word mark No. 1163412, registered on August 4, 1981, for inter alia heaters, cookers, dryers, ventilators, and thermal devices in International Class 11.
- United States mark No. 2809696 (figurative), registered on February 3, 2004, for inter alia chemicals used in industry and science in International Class 1 and industrial cleaning preparations for use on centrifugal separators, heat exchangers, pumps, and valves in International Class 3.

The Complainant uses the domain name <alfalaval.com> as its main online marketing portal and has incorporated its ALFA LAVAL mark in numerous other Top-Level Domains, including “.us”, “.co.uk”, and “.cn”.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 3, 2025, through a privacy service. It was inactive when the Complaint was filed, but the disputed domain name was used to send an email purporting to emanate from the Complainant requesting financial information.

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 almost identical to the Complainant's ALFA LAVAL mark. The only difference is the addition of the letter “f” at the end of the disputed domain name. The ALFA LAVAL mark enjoys a high reputation particularly in Sweden (where it qualifies as a well-known trademark) and in China.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, which the Respondent registered and uses in bad faith to defraud the Complainant's customers through phishing activities.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to “decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.”

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that the disputed domain name should be cancelled or transferred:

- (i) the domain name registered by the Respondent 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 domain name; and
- (iii) the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

In view of the Respondent’s failure to submit a Response, the Panel shall decide these administrative proceedings on the basis of the Complainant’s undisputed representations pursuant to paragraphs 5(f), 14(a) and 15(a) of the Rules and draw such inferences as it considers appropriate pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules. The Panel is entitled to accept all reasonable allegations set forth in a complaint. However, the Panel may deny relief where a complaint contains mere conclusory or unsubstantiated arguments. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)), section 4.3.

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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the trademark ALFA LAVAL 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 with the only addition of the letter “f” at its end. The Panel finds the mark is nevertheless clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name, and the additional letter does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 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 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here claimed as applicable to this case: phishing, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1. Furthermore, the Panel considers that the Respondent's use of "alfalavalf" as the organization name when registering the disputed domain name does not confer any rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent under the circumstances of this case.

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.

The Complainant has shown that its ALFA LAVAL trademark is registered in many jurisdictions including in the United States where the Respondent is supposedly based. The ALFA LAVAL enjoys a high reputation in several jurisdictions including in Sweden in China and has been recognized as a well-known trademark by several WIPO panels in domain name disputes. Furthermore, the case file shows that the Complainant has an Internet presence where the ALFA LAVAL is widely used.

Under the circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew or should have known about the Complainant's trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here claimed phishing, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud 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.

Finally, the use of a privacy service for registering the disputed domain name, the fact that the contact details provided to the Registry are likely to be false and that the Respondent did not participate in the proceedings are additional factors of bad faith.

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 <alfalavalf.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Theda König Horowicz/

Theda König Horowicz

Sole Panelist

Date: December 15, 2025