

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Empresas Iansa S.A. v. Manuel Iansa, Empresa azucar spa
Case No. D2025-4788

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Empresas Iansa S.A., Chile, represented by Sargent & Krahn Procuradores Internacionales de Patentes y Marcas Ltda., Chile.

The Respondent is Manuel Iansa, Empresa azucar spa, Chile.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <empresasiansa.com> is registered with SRSplus (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 18, 2025. On November 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 27, 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”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 27, 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 28, 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 December 2, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 22, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 26, 2025.

The Center appointed Rodrigo Velasco Santelices as the sole panelist in this matter on January 7, 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

Empresas Iansa S.A. operates and is widely known in the international market, mainly under the trademark IANSA in products and services related to the production of food and agricultural ingredients like sugar, sweeteners or legumes.

IANSA stands for Industrial Azucarera Nacional Sociedad Anonima, and it was founded in 1953; with more than 70 years of history, today it is recognized as one of the largest sugar companies in Chile.

EMPRESAS Iansa S.A. has a presence all over the country, with nine production plants, five commercial offices and ten distribution centers.

It is in this context that Empresas Iansa S.A. has been diligent enough to protect its assets and owns several trademark registrations in Chile and abroad for the trademarks EMPRESAS IANSA and IANSA that predate the disputed domain name.

This trademark portfolio was built to safeguard the reputation and goodwill associated with its products and services. Some of these numerous trademarks registered in Chile, are:

Registration No. 853174, EMPRESAS IANSA, to distinguish services of class 35, dated June 19, 2009.

Registration No. 1220496, EMPRESAS IANSA, to distinguish products of classes 1, 4, 29, 30 and 32, dated September 9, 2016.

Registration No. 862226, EMPRESAS IANSA, to distinguish services of class 39, dated July 21, 2009.

With regard to foreign registrations, the Complainant has registered for example the following:

Registration No. 499342, IANSA, to distinguish products of class 30, in Colombia, dated June 5, 2024.

Registration No. 499344, IANSA CERO K, to distinguish products of classes 1 and 30, in Colombia, dated June 5, 2024.

Registration No. 501039, IANSA CERO K, to distinguish products of class 30, in Paraguay, dated February 20, 2020.

Registration No. 211408, IANSA, to distinguish products of class 30, in Peru, dated May 30, 2024.

It is important to note that all the trademark registrations detailed above predate the registration of the disputed domain name <empresasiansa.com>, that was registered on September 11, 2025.

Additionally, the Complainant is the owner of the following domain names, just to name a few, all of which are structured upon the expression Empresas IANSA (or its derivations):

- (i) <empresasiansa.cl> registered on September 1, 1999.
- (ii) <empresaiansa.cl> registered on May 20, 2021.
- (iii) <empresas-iansa.cl> registered on June 14, 2013.

It is important to note that all the domain names listed above also predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name <empresasiansa.com> is extraordinarily relevant because it is absolutely identical to its legal name, as well as to its famous and well-known marks EMPRESAS IANSA and IANSA, properly registered in the Chilean Trademark Office and abroad.

Therefore, the Respondent is not the legitimate creator of the expression IANSA, and, at present, they are not related in any way to the Complainant, so they have no rights or legitimate interests in <empresasiansa.com>.

Furthermore, the lack of rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain name is evident, especially considering that his real intention was to use it in order to pass off as an official domain name of the Complainant, via emails which impersonated a real employee of the Complainant to obtain products from its providers.

Despite the fact that the Respondent has stated that their last name is “Iansa”, it is important to note that this information cannot be verified. It also seems highly unlikely since it is not a surname in Chile, and it would be too much of a coincidence that this is a real person, who additionally works at a joint stock company called Sugar Company (the same line of business of the Complainant), all according to the information he provided to the Registrar. Therefore, it is more than clear that he is trying to hide his real identity.

Finally, the disputed domain name has not been used for non-commercial gain but rather to mislead the public.

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 it is the owner of the registered trademarks EMPRESAS IANSA and IANSA, so it cannot be questioned that the disputed domain name <empresasiansa.com> is identical to the trademark registrations of the Complainant. The disputed domain name reproduces one of the Complainant's registered trademarks in its entirety.

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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical 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 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity, here claimed as applicable to this case: phishing, impersonation and passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Furthermore, the Panel finds that the nature of the disputed domain name carries a high risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark.

The Respondent has been using the disputed domain name to create an email account to impersonate a manager of the Complainant, to contact suppliers to request products, emit fake purchase orders, and possibly never pay for the delivered products.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity, here claimed as applicable to this case: phishing, impersonation or 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 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 <empresasiansa.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Rodrigo Velasco Santelices/

Rodrigo Velasco Santelices

Sole Panelist

Date: January 19, 2026