

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Alfa Laval Corporate AB v. Maryna Davidiuk, Barauba UAB  
Case No. D2025-4436

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is Maryna Davidiuk, Barauba UAB, Lithuania.

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

The disputed domain names <alfa-laval.online>, <alfa-laval.shop>, and <alfa-laval.store> are 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 28, 2025. On October 28, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On October 29, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names 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 31, 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 the amended Complaints on November 4, 2025 and November 7, 2025, respectively.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 November 12, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 2, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 4, 2025.

The Center appointed Fabrizio Bedarida as the sole panelist in this matter on December 12, 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 in this administrative proceeding is Alfa Laval Corporate AB, a company duly incorporated and organized under the laws of Sweden. The Complainant operates within the key technology areas of heat transfer, separation and gas and fluid handling across many industries, including but not limited to the marine, environment, pharma, hygienic, food and energy sectors. The Complainant's business was established in 1883 under the company name AB Separator, which was changed to Alfa-Laval AB in 1963. The Complainant filed its first trademark application for the ALFA LAVAL trademark in 1897.

The Complainant has provided full listings of trademarks that correspond to and/or include ALFA LAVAL, registered in jurisdictions around the world.

The Complainant is, inter alia, the owner of:

- Swedish Trademark Registration number 6089 for the ALFA LAVAL (device) trademark, registered on December 13, 1897;
- European Union Trademark Registration number 018170847 for the ALFA LAVAL (device) trademark, registered on June 24, 2020;
- European Union Trademark Registration number 003481702 for the ALFA LAVAL (device) trademark, registered on March 3, 2005; and
- United States of America Trademark Registration number 1163412 for the ALFA LAVAL (word) trademark, registered on August 4, 1981.

The Complainant also owns multiple domain names incorporating the ALFA LAVAL trademark, including the domain name <alfalaval.com>, its main online marketing portal.

The ALFA LAVAL trademarks enjoy a widespread reputation, as noted also in several previous UDRP decisions.

The disputed domain names were registered on October 9, 2025 and are parked with 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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the ALFA LAVAL trademark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names, and particularly that it is implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's renowned trademark when it registered the disputed domain names. The disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

In order for the Complainant to obtain a transfer of the disputed domain names, paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainant must demonstrate to the Panel that:

- (i) the disputed domain names are 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 names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are 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 names. 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 Panel finds the mark is incorporated entirely and recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Moreover, the nature of the disputed domain names, which only adds a hyphen in the Complainant's trademark, is inherently misleading as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Based on the available record, 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 finds that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark registrations and rights to the ALFA LAVAL trademark when it registered the disputed domain names. The term "Alfa Laval" is neither generic nor descriptive, but a distinctive and well-known trademark at least in the Complainant's field. All the three disputed domain names contain, without any authorization or approval, the entirety of the Complainant's registered ALFA LAVAL trademark, and this is the only distinctive component of the disputed domain names. Indeed, the disputed domain names are practically identical to the Complainant's ALFA LAVAL trademark and <alfalaval.com> domain name.

The disputed domain names were registered more than a hundred years after the Complainant's renowned trademark was registered. In addition, owing to the substantial presence established worldwide and on the Internet by the Complainant, and the fact that all the three disputed domain names are practically identical to the Complainant's trademark, it is very unlikely that the Respondent was not aware of the existence of the Complainant's trademark when registering the disputed domain names. Therefore, it is more likely than not that the Respondent, when registering the disputed domain names, had knowledge of the Complainant's earlier rights to the ALFA LAVAL trademark and name and targeted those.

In addition, panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or 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.

The disputed domain names are parked at the Registrar's website without being actively used. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) 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 and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain names, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain names are further supported by the Respondent's failure to deny the Complainant's allegations of bad faith in this proceeding.

Based on the available record, 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 names <alfa-laval.online>, <alfa-laval.shop>, and <alfa-laval.store> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Fabrizio Bedarida/*

**Fabrizio Bedarida**

Sole Panelist

Date: December 19, 2025