

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson v. John S, Ericsson, Phoenix King,  
ericsson-usa

Case No. D2025-4633

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson, Sweden, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondents are John S, Ericsson, Nigeria, and Phoenix King, ericsson-usa, Nigeria.

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

The disputed domain names <ericssoninc.com>, and <ericsson-usa.com> are registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 7, 2025. On November 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On November 10, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 11, 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 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 28, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 18, 2025. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on December 19, 2025.

The Center appointed Anita Gerewal as the sole panelist in this matter on December 29, 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 Swedish-incorporated company. Established in 1876, it is a worldwide leader in communications technology and services, offering ICT solutions such as software, infrastructure, and services for telecommunications operators, including mobile and fixed broadband, IP networking, IPTV, and video systems.

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registrations:

TRADEMARK	JURISDICTION	REGISTRATION NUMBER	REGISTRATION DATE	INTERNATIONAL CLASS
ERICSSON	United States of America	1313196	January 8, 1985	09
ERICSSON	Australia	322638	October 3, 1978	09
ERICSSON	European Union	000107003	March 23, 1999	09, 11, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, and 42
ERICSSON	International Registration	1024858	October 7, 2009	09, 11, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 41, 42, and 45

The Complainant has a well-established online presence and engages with customers through its main website at the domain name <ericsson.com>, which has been registered since 1989.

The disputed domain names <ericssoninc.com> and <ericsson-usa.com> were registered on August 3, 2025, and September 27, 2025. The Complainant has provided evidence showing that phishing emails were sent from an email address [...]@ericsson-usa.com impersonating the Complainant's HR manager, instructing recipients to communicate with the email addresses [...]@ericsson-usa.com, and [...]@ericssoninc.com.

#### 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 Complainant owns registered trademark and service mark rights in the ERICSSON mark, which satisfy the UDRP standing requirement regardless of the jurisdiction in which the marks are registered. The Complainant contends that disputed domain names incorporate the ERICSSON trademark in its entirety with the addition of generic terms such as "usa" and "inc", which does not eliminate confusing similarity. The inclusion of descriptive or geographic terms, as well as the use of a hyphen, is insufficient to distinguish the disputed domain names from the Complainant's trademark, and therefore the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the ERICSSON mark.

The Complainant contends that the Respondents are neither affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant and have not been granted permission to use the ERICSSON trademark, including in domain names. There is no evidence that the Respondents are commonly known by the disputed domain names, as reflected in the Whois records and despite misleading self-identification suggesting an association with the Complainant. The Complainant contends that the use of privacy services and false identification further supports the conclusion that the Respondents lack rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondents have not made any bona fide or legitimate use of the disputed domain names. Instead, the disputed domain names were used to impersonate the Complainant and its employees in a phishing scheme targeting jobseekers, conduct that can never confer rights or legitimate interests under the Policy. The disputed domain names resolve to blank pages, demonstrating a lack of legitimate use. The disputed domain names were registered decades after the Complainant's longstanding trademark registrations, first use in commerce dating back to 1876, and registration of the domain name <ericsson.com> in 1989, further confirming the Respondents' absence of rights or legitimate interests.

The Complainant submits that given the fame of the Complainant's mark and the Respondents' use of the disputed domain names to impersonate the Complainant in an employment phishing scheme, it is inconceivable that the Respondents were unaware of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration, and the registration itself strongly implies opportunistic bad faith. The Respondents' use of the disputed domain names to send fraudulent emails, passive holding of confusingly similar disputed domain names, use of privacy services, and provision of false Whois information to appear affiliated with the Complainant all constitute compelling evidence of bad faith registration and use under the Policy, demonstrating that the Respondents intentionally targeted the Complainant's trademark for fraudulent purposes.

## **B. Respondents**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **6.1. Preliminary Issue: Consolidation of Multiple Respondents**

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names were registered with the same Registrar, and were registered by the Respondents located in the same country, Nigeria, within a relatively short period of approximately two months, namely between August and September 2025. In addition, the verified Whois records for both disputed domain names disclose the same telephone number. The Panel further notes the Complainant's evidence showing that phishing emails were sent from an email address

[...][@ericsson-usa.com](mailto:ericsson-usa.com)>, instructing recipients to communicate with the email addresses [...][@ericsson-usa.com](mailto:ericsson-usa.com) and [...][@ericssoninc.com](mailto:ericssoninc.com). Taken together, these circumstances satisfy the Panel that the disputed domain names are subject to common control and were used as part of the same fraudulent employment scheme.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as “the Respondent”) in a single proceeding.

## **6.2. Substantive Issues**

### **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 the ERICSSON trademark 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 names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the ERICSSON mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, “inc” and “usa” 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 names 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 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.

The Panel notes that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Panel further notes that, according to the Complaint, the Respondent is using the disputed domain names in connection with a fraudulent employment scheme. The Complaint includes the email content associated with the disputed domain names, which convincingly evidence this conduct. The Respondent has not denied the Complainant's allegations. Accordingly, there is no evidence of any bona fide offering of goods or services or of any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed phishing, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1. The Respondent's use of "Ericsson" and "ericsson-usa" as the organization names when registering the disputed domain names cannot 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.

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.

The Complainant's trademark is well known and the composition of the disputed domain names, reproducing the Complainant's mark in its entirety added by the terms "inc" and "usa", indicates to the Panel that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with the Complainant in mind and thus, that the registrations of the disputed domain names were in bad faith.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed phishing 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 names constitutes 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 names <ericssoninc.com>, and <ericsson-usa.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Anita Gerewal/*

**Anita Gerewal**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 12, 2026