

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Archer-Daniels-Midland Company v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2025-4540

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Archer-Daniels-Midland Company, United States of America (the “United States”), represented by Innis Law Group LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Name Redacted¹.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <admtarimas.com> is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 3, 2025. On November 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 5, 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 (Whols Privacy Protection Foundation) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 6, 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 November 6, 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

¹The Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent’s name from this Decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this Decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in these proceedings and has indicated Annex 1 to this Decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

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 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 30, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 4, 2025.

The Center appointed Richard C.K. van Oerle as the sole panelist in this matter on December 9, 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 multinational food processing and commodities trading corporation, founded in 1902 and headquartered in Illinois, United States, which has operated under the ADM brand since 1923. The Complainant conducts business in over 200 countries, owns more than 800 facilities, and employs over 38,000 people worldwide. In 2023, its global net sales amounted to USD 93 billion. Originally established as a food and ingredients company, its operations now extend to printing and publishing, financial and business management services, fuel production, logistics (such as agricultural storage and transportation), as well as research and development.

The Complainant holds numerous trademark registrations for ADM on a worldwide basis, inter alia:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 1386430, ADM, registered on March 18, 1986, in classes 1, 4, 12, 16, 29, 30, 31, and 39;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 2766613, ADM, registered on September 23, 2003, in classes 16, 35, 36, and 42; and
- United States Trademark Registration No. 7689652, ADM, figurative mark, registered on February 11, 2025, in class 40, with the following graphic representation:



hereinafter collectively referred to, in singular, as the “Trademark”.

The Complainant maintains a global online presence through multiple websites, with <www.adm.com> serving as its primary website. This domain name was registered on October 12, 1994.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 26, 2025. It resolved to a website purporting to sell vehicles, agricultural machinery, and industrial raw materials. The website displayed the Complainant’s official leaf logo, as shown above, without the letters ADM, as well as the company name of a Complainant’s subsidiary in Türkiye, a phone number and a postal address in Türkiye.

At the time of this Decision the disputed domain name was inactive.

Prior decisions under the UDRP have recognized the worldwide reputation of the Trademark. See, e.g., *Archer-Daniels-Midland Company v. Truehost Cloud, Truehostcloud LTD*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0997](#); *Archer-Daniels-Midland Company v. ADM, ADM*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-5357](#); and *Archer-Daniels-Midland Company v. Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1618](#).

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 confusingly similar to its Trademark because it fully incorporates the Trademark which is recognizable within the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the added term "tarimas" does not reduce this similarity. Instead, it allegedly increases the likelihood of confusion by implying a connection with the Complainant's activities - particularly because the term "tarim" in Turkish translates to "agriculture" in English. It is a sector in which the Complainant is well known.

The Complainant submits that consumers would perceive "adm" as the Complainant's well-established ADM brand and will therefore assume that the disputed domain name is officially linked to the Complainant. They also point to the Respondent's use of the Complainant's Trademark on the associated website as evidence that the disputed domain name was intentionally selected to appear legitimate.

The Complainant further argues that the disputed domain name is conceptually, and phonetically similar to the Trademark, as the only difference is the addition of the term "tarimas", which they say does not prevent the finding of confusing similarity. They contend that Internet users seeking to interact with the Complainant could easily be misled into believing that the disputed domain name forms part of the Complainant's online presence.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the Respondent is not commonly known by this name, which was registered only recently and immediately used in a fraudulent scheme aimed at misleading individuals into believing they were dealing with the Complainant. This alleged conduct, in the Complainant's view, eliminates any possibility of rights or legitimate interests.

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services and is not engaged in any legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Instead, the disputed domain name was used to impersonate the Complainant and deceive third parties, thereby tarnishing the Complainant's Trademark. The Complainant also notes that the disputed domain name is currently inactive, which shows the absence of preparation for any legitimate use.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith. According to the Complainant, the Respondent intentionally exploited the Complainant's well-known Trademark, name, and global reputation to deceive individuals for financial gain.

The Complainant states that immediately after registration of the disputed domain name, the Respondent launched a fraudulent website that appeared to offer vehicles, agricultural machinery, and other products, while prominently displaying the Complainant's leaf logo and presenting itself as an affiliated company. At the bottom of the homepage the site states "Copyright © 2025 All rights reserved by [the name of the Complainant's subsidiary]" clearly in an attempt to make the webpage seem legitimate. The Complainant submits that these actions were designed to mislead the public into believing the site was legitimate.

The Complainant also argues that the Respondent could not plausibly have been unaware of the Complainant's rights, given the Complainant's international recognition and the Respondent's direct use of the Complainant's Trademark. Further, the domain name was registered under the name of a legitimate ADM subsidiary in Türkiye that produces starch and glucose syrup.

The Complainant contends that the circumstances indicate both bad-faith registration and bad-faith use.

The Complainant further notes that the use of the disputed domain name resembles another fraudulent website at the domain name <adm-besin.com> that used similar branding and the same phone number, reinforcing the view that the Respondent acted in bad faith. A Panel held that that domain name was registered and used in bad faith (see *Archer-Daniels-Midland Company v. Kate Brooks*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3522](#)).

According to the Complainant, such conduct undermines trust in the Complainant's communications and harms relationships with customers, business partners, and job applicants. Moreover, the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name is in and of itself sufficient in this case for a finding of bad faith given that the Trademark is so well-known internationally.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must prove each of the following three elements in order to succeed in its complaint:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark 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 name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The burden of proof of each element is borne by the Complainant. The Respondent's default does not by itself mean that the Complainant is deemed to have prevailed. 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 a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here, the terms "tarim" and "as", 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 Trademark 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.

There is no evidence that the Respondent is known by “adm” or the disputed domain name. In fact, the disputed domain name was registered under the false name which is a legitimate ADM subsidiary of the Complainant in Türkiye.

The Respondent used the disputed domain name for a website prominently featuring the Trademark and the Complainant’s leaf logo and purporting to offer goods closely related to goods and services the Complainant offers. Given the prominent use of the Trademark on the website and in the disputed domain name itself with additional elements “tarim” (Turkish for “agriculture”) and “as” (the common abbreviation in Turkish of “anonim şirket” – the designation of a type of company under Turkish law, comparable to the United States “Inc.” for “incorporated”), which actually create the suggestion of a connection with the Complainant, consumers are likely to believe that the disputed domain name is related to, affiliated with, or otherwise sponsored by the Complainant, and this is not the case. The Respondent therefore uses the disputed domain name to deliberately cause consumer confusion with the Complainant and its goods. Accordingly, the Respondent cannot establish any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name that incorporates the Trademark and cannot prevail under the Policy.

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.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes the Trademark’s long-standing (over a century) and worldwide reputation, coupled with the inclusion of this Trademark in the disputed domain name along with the additional terms “tarim” and “as” (as described above under section 6.B.), which closely relate to the

Complainant's business. The Panel notes that the food industry is one of the Complainant's primary and original core businesses, and the manner in which the disputed domain name was used, which indicates that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

Section 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) states that "the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain name 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". In the present case, the Panel notes, as many panels have noted before, that the Trademark is a famous and worldwide-known trademark.

The fact that the content of the website explicitly suggests an affiliation with the Complainant, as well as the fact that the disputed domain name was registered under the name of a legitimate subsidiary of the Complainant in Türkiye, indicates that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

As considered above under section 6.B., the website to which the disputed domain name resolved, used the company name of the Complainant's subsidiary, and prominently displayed the Complainant's leaf logo, creating a clear impression of being a website of an affiliated company of the Complainant. It is apparent that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name to trade-off the Complainant's goodwill in its Trademark and to confuse consumers into believing that the disputed domain name is affiliated or associated with the Complainant, which is not the case.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here 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.

The current non-use of the disputed domain name does not preclude a finding of bad faith. UDRP panels have established that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant's Trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, and all other factors indicating bad faith. In these circumstances, 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 <admtarimas.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Richard C.K. van Oerle/

Richard C.K. van Oerle

Sole Panelist

Date: December 16, 2025.