

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Nammo Lapua Oy v. Maddison Bryan, CEO
Case No. D2025-4287

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Nammo Lapua Oy, Finland, represented by Heinonen & Co, Attorneys-at-Law, Ltd., Finland.

The Respondent is Maddison Bryan, CEO, United States of America (the “United States”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lapuabrassco.com> is registered with Cosmotown, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 20, 2025. On October 20, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 23, 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 (“Private Registrant(s) and Cosmotown, Inc.,”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 23, 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 27, 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 28, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 17, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 21, 2025.

The Center appointed Áron László as the sole panelist in this matter on December 1, 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 was founded in Finland in 1923 and has become a leading manufacturer of high-quality small-calibre ammunition. It is part of the Nammo Group, which is one of the world's largest suppliers of ammunition and rocket motors.

The Complainant owns several trademarks that protect the word 'LAPUA' in the United States, Canada, and the European Union. These trademarks include:

- United States trademark LAPUA (word) Reg. No. 2043495 registered on March 11, 1997;
- United States trademark L LAPUA (figurative) Reg. No. 3841569 registered on August 31, 2010;
- European Union trademark LAPUA (word) Reg. No. 008400582 registered on March 22, 2010.

The United States trademark LAPUA (word) Reg. No. 2043495, is claimed to have first been used on December 31, 1957.

The well-known status of the Complainant's trademarks has been confirmed in previous UDRP decisions: in *Nammo Lapua Oy v. Lucas Harper*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-4369](#) in 2023, in *Nammo Lapua Oy v. Lucas Harper, aretosteroids*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-1629](#), in *Nammo Lapua Oy v. CEO, RESTRO ENGOH*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-4662](#) in 2023, and in *Nammo Lapua Oy v. Mason Silver*, CEO, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0702](#), in April, 2025.

The main website of the Complainant is available at the domain name <lapua.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 14, 2025. The disputed domain name relates to a website offering ammunition for sale under the sign "LAPUA Store USA". All of the types of ammunition offered for sale on the website bear the name 'Lapua', e.g. 'Lapua .260 Remington Unprimed Rifle Brass'.

The Respondent appears to be a private individual residing in the United States, as indicated by the information disclosed by the Registrar.

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 identical to, or at least confusingly similar to, the Complainant's trademarks. The disputed domain name consists of: (1) the distinctive verbal element of the Complainant's LAPUA trademarks; (2) the non-distinctive English word "brass"; and (3) the non-distinctive word element "co", short for "company". The word 'brass' can be understood as a reference to a material that consumers would associate with ammunition — namely, a yellow alloy of copper and zinc — and therefore as a reference to the Complainant's business. The disputed domain name begins with the distinctive LAPUA element, which is identical to the trademarks of the Complainant.

With regard to the second element, the Complainant contends that merely registering the disputed domain name does not confer any rights or legitimate interests in it. To the best of the Complainant's knowledge, the Respondent is not authorised to use the Complainant's trademarks. The Respondent does not have any trademark or service mark registration that would entitle them to use the LAPUA sign. The verbal element

LAPUA which is included in the Complainant's trademarks is not a generic word for the English-speaking relevant public. The word 'LAPUA' has been registered to the Complainant under several trademark registrations in the United States and elsewhere around the world.

The unauthorised and misleading use of the Complainant's trademarks on the Respondent's website does not give the Respondent any independent rights to them. The Respondent cannot be considered as "bona fide offering goods and services" since the use is not truthful.

The lack of legitimate interests in the domain name is also evident, given that the Respondent provided false contact information to the Registrar. The postcode does not match the address, and the apartment number within the residential building is missing. Furthermore, the phone number provided by the Respondent to the Registrar has been used in connection with at least four previous domain name registrations that were the subject of trademark abuse complaints by the Complainant in UDRP cases.

Regarding the third element, the Complainant contends that the Respondent was aware of the well-known and reputable LAPUA trademarks. Furthermore, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in the same field of business as the Complainant and is using the trademarks and brand on its website. It is therefore clear that the registration of the disputed domain name was made in bad faith. The Respondent is fraudulently exploiting the Complainant's reputation and well-known trademarks to gain an unfair advantage in its own business. The Respondent is using the LAPUA trademarks, product descriptions and images from the official website of the Complainant's retailer without authorisation to mislead Internet users as to the ownership and sponsorship of the website at the disputed domain name. By using the trademarks without authorisation, the Respondent is taking unfair advantage of the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant's well-known trademarks.

The Respondent's use of the LAPUA sign on their website and the date on which the disputed domain name was registered, as well as their use of the trademarks and the disputed domain name in connection with the marketing and alleged sale of goods identical to those sold by the Complainant, clearly indicates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's rights and business at the time of registering the disputed domain name.

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 based on the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable. Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that a complainant must prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that a 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;
- 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 this administrative proceeding based on 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 may accept all reasonable allegations set forth in a complaint. However, the Panel may deny relief where a complaint wholly contains mere conclusory or unsubstantiated arguments. 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 a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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.

Although the addition of other terms here, "brass" and "co" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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 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 Complainant has not authorised the Respondent to use its trademarks. The verbal element LAPUA which is included in the Complainant's trademarks is not a descriptive word for the English-speaking relevant public. Although LAPUA is the name of a city in Finland where the Complainant is registered, there is no suggestion that the Respondent is known by this city name or would make fair use of it.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here, impersonation/passing off 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 this case, the Panel has found that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to their website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark. The complainant is a well-known producer of ammunition and has been active worldwide for over 100 years. It first used the LAPUA trademark in the United States, where the Respondent resides, in 1957, and has held trademarks there for over 25 years. Given the Complainant's reputation, and the fact that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to sell ammunition, it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's trademark when registering the disputed domain name. Therefore, the registration of the disputed domain name was in bad faith.

The Respondent is acting in bad faith by using the Complainant's reputation, well-known trademarks, product descriptions and images from the official website of the Complainant's retailer to mislead Internet users as to the ownership and sponsorship of the website at the disputed domain name. By using the trademarks without authorisation, the Respondent is taking unfair advantage of the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant's well-known trademarks.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute 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 <lapuabrassco.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Áron László/

Áron László

Sole Panelist

Date: December 15, 2025