

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Samyang Foods Inc. v. Angel Ramirez, Productos Integrales del Campo
Case No. D2025-4656

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Samyang Foods Inc., Republic of Korea, represented by Iberbrand, S.C., Mexico.

The Respondent is Angel Ramirez, Productos Integrales del Campo, Mexico.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <buldakmexico.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 10, 2025. On November 11, 2025, the Center transmitted an email to the Registrar requesting registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 11, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 12, 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 14, 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 January 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for the Response was February 10, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Ada L. Redondo Aguilera as the sole panelist in this matter on February 18, 2026. 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 corporation from the Republic of Korea. The Complainant sells ramen products in the Republic of Korea and in approximately 90 countries around the world.

One of the Complainant's products is BULDAK ramen, which is a spicy ramen. This brand is also used for noodle dishes, rice dishes, sauces, and the like. According to Wikipedia, BULDAK (Korean: 불닭볶음면) means "fire chicken" and this instant noodle product is not only popular in the Republic of Korea but also worldwide, and is the Complainant's best-selling product, with four billion cumulative sales by August 2022.

The Complainant owns several trademark registrations for BULDAK, including trademark registration titles issued by the INSTITUTO MEXICANO DE LA PROPIEDAD INTELECTUAL, ("IMPI") in Mexico:

Trademark BULDAK and design. Filing date: August 2, 2023, and registered on December 12, 2023 registration number 2639713.

Trademark BULDAK and design. Filing date: August 2, 2023, and registered on December 12, 2023 registration number 2642939.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 5, 2025. According to the Registrar's records, the Respondent is located in Mexico.

Before the present Decision, the disputed domain name resolved to a website advertising the Complainant's ramen products. The headline of the website stated "BULDAK" displayed in the same letter style as in the Complainant's trademark registrations. Currently, the disputed domain name is inactive.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the three 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 the Complainant's BULDAK trademark, notwithstanding the inclusion of the additional geographical term "Mexico". It is asserted that the addition of the geographical term "Mexico" is insufficient to render the disputed domain name distinct from the BULDAK trademark, since the geographical term relates to a place where the Complainant has presence and where it distributes its products-

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests regarding the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the Respondent has not made any legitimate or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Complainant further alleges that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of the other geographical term, "mexico," may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of such a term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Furthermore, the Panel finds that the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") in the present case, ".com", may typically be disregarded when assessing whether a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark, as it is a technical requirement of registration. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that 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 that 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 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case and 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.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy sets out circumstances that may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests. The Complainant asserts that it has not authorized the Respondent to use its BULDAK trademark and that there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the name "Buldak".

According to the evidence presented in the present case, the website displayed in the disputed domain name reproduced the Complainant's stylized logo, mascot, and product packaging and offered identical goods.

Evidence presented by the Complainant proves that the Respondent presents itself as “Buldak Distribuidor México,” strongly implying official affiliation. Under the section 2.5.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), a respondent cannot claim rights or legitimate interests where it falsely suggests affiliation with the complainant. The Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant’s trademark BULDAK in its entirety with the addition of a geographic term “mexico” carries a risk of implied affiliation. Moreover, even applying the reseller principles set out in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#), publicly known as the “Oki Data Test” the Respondent would fail the test.

The website does not accurately disclose its relationship (or lack thereof) with the Complainant and instead falsely implies endorsement. Such conduct disqualifies any claim to bona fide offering of goods or services. ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8).

The evidence presented in this procedure further suggests fraudulent activity and non-delivery of goods. The use of the disputed domain name for impersonation or fraud cannot confer rights or legitimate interests. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here claimed as applicable to this case: sale of counterfeit goods or (unlicensed), passing off, or other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds that the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for 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 knew that BULDAK is a distinctive and internationally recognized mark before the registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name wholly incorporates the trademark and targets Mexican consumers of identical goods.

Under section 3.2.2 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), where a trademark is widely known, and the disputed domain name clearly targets it, panels infer knowledge at the time of registration. The Panel finds it inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant’s trademark rights.

Under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, bad faith is established where a domain name is used intentionally to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy, and accordingly, the Panel notes the following:

Impersonation and Commercial Gain

The website copies the Complainant’s branding, mascot, and product presentation (and even includes the notice “© Samyang Foods, Inc. All Rights Reserved,” falsely implying official ownership. Such conduct falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Evidence of Fraudulent Conduct

The evidence presented in the case refers to social media reports alleging non-delivery after payment of products in the disputed domain name. Panels consistently hold that the use of a disputed domain name for fraudulent sales schemes evidences bad faith ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1). Section 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) confirms that the use of a domain name for phishing, fraud, or impersonation constitutes bad faith.

Disruption of Business

By presenting itself as an apparent “official distributor,” the Respondent diverts customers from the Complainant’s authorized channels, disrupting its business ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.3).

The totality of the evidence that incorporates a well-known mark, the addition of a territorial indicator, such as Mexico, replication of logos and mascot, false copyright notice, commercial sales activity, and consumer complaints of fraud, overwhelmingly supports a finding that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity or illegal activity, here claimed as: sale of counterfeit goods or (unlicensed), passing off, or other types of fraud, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name currently resolves to an inactive page and that such passive holding does not prevent a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this case, particularly considering the Respondent’s prior deceptive use (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3).

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 <buldakmexico.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ada L. Redondo Aguilera/

Ada L. Redondo Aguilera

Sole Panelist

Date: February 27, 2026