

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Philip Morris Products S.A. v. Md Jaber Hossain  
Case No. D2025-4580

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Philip Morris Products S.A., Switzerland, represented by D.M. Kisch Inc., South Africa.

The Respondent is Md Jaber Hossain, Bangladesh.

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

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

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 5, 2025. On November 6, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 6, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 10, 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 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 November 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 8, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 12, 2025.

The Center appointed Elizabeth Ann Morgan as the sole panelist in this matter on December 18, 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 Philip Morris Products S.A. is a company which is part of the group of companies affiliated to Philip Morris International Inc. (jointly referred to as "PMI"). PMI is one of the leading international tobacco and smoke-free products companies, with products sold in approximately 180 countries. PMI's unequalled brand portfolio contains brands like MARLBORO (outside of the United States of America and Canada), selling cigarette internationally since 1972.

PMI is known for innovating across its brand portfolio. In transforming its business from combustible cigarettes to Reduced Risk Products (or "RRPs", which PMI defines as products that present, are likely to present, or have the potential to present less risk of harm to smokers who switch to those products versus continued smoking), PMI has developed a number of RRP. One of these RRP developed and sold by PMI is a tobacco heating system called IQOS. IQOS is a precisely controlled heating device into which specially designed tobacco sticks under the brand names HEETS, HeatSticks, DELIA, LEVIA or TERE are inserted and heated to generate a flavourful nicotine-containing aerosol (collectively referred to as the "IQOS System").

Today the IQOS System is available in key cities in around 84 markets across the world. As a result of an investment of over USD 12.5 billion into the science and research of developing smoke-free products and extensive international sales (in accordance with local laws), the IQOS System has achieved success and reputation, and approximately 33 million relevant consumers are using PMI's smoke-free products, including the IQOS System worldwide. To date, the IQOS System has been almost exclusively distributed through PMI's official IQOS stores and websites and selected authorized distributors and retailers.

For its new innovative smoke-free products the Complainant owns a large portfolio of trademarks. Among them, but by no means limited to, are the following trademark registrations:

- International Registration HEETS (word) No. 1326410 registered on July 19, 2016, designating multiple jurisdictions; and
- International Registration IQOS (word) No. 1218246 registered on July 10, 2014, designating multiple jurisdictions.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 21, 2025, and is linked to an online shop at "www.iqosdubaiheets.com" allegedly selling and offering the Complainant's IQOS System, as well as competing third party products of other commercial origin. The website further uses the Complainant's official product images without authorization, while at the same time falsely claiming copyright in this material. The website includes no information regarding the identity of the provider of the website, which is only identified as "IQOS TERE HEETS" on the website.

#### **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 as the Complainant's IQOS System is primarily distributed through official / endorsed stores (as detailed above), in this case Internet users / relevant consumers are clearly misled regarding the relationship between the website and the Complainant, and will falsely believe the website under the disputed domain name to be an official / endorsed distributor. Such use of the disputed domain name cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods and does not establish a legitimate interest on behalf of the Respondent.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **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 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 disputed domain name identically adopts the Complainant's IQOS and HEETS trademarks. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "dubai", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the marks 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 Panel considers that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. The disputed domain name resolves to a website purportedly offering the Complainant's IQOS System, as well as competing third party products of other commercial origin. Such use cannot constitute any bona fide offering of goods or services, nor legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

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 notes that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name with the intention to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's registered IQOS and/or HEETS trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or location or of a product or service on its website or location, which constitutes registration and use in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Further by reproducing the Complainant's registered trademarks in the disputed domain name and the title of the website, the Respondent is clearly suggesting to any Internet user visiting a website provided under the disputed domain name that the Complainant (or an affiliated dealer of the Complainant) is the source of the website, which it is not. This suggestion is further supported by the Respondent's use of the Complainant's official product images accompanied by a copyright notice claiming the copyright for the website and its contents. Additionally, the Respondent is not only using the Complainant's IQOS and HEETS trademarks for the purposes of offering for sale the IQOS System, but also for purposes of offering for sale third party products of other commercial origin. Such abusive use of the Complainant's IQOS and HEETS trademarks for purposes of promoting competing products constitutes evidence of the Respondent's bad faith.

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 <iqosdubaiheets.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Elizabeth Ann Morgan/*

**Elizabeth Ann Morgan**

Sole Panelist

Date: December 30, 2025