

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SSA Merchandise Limited v. Milon Baral

Case No. D2025-4830

1. The Parties

The Complainant is SSA Merchandise Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Ström Advokatbyra KB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Milon Baral, Bangladesh.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <swedishhousemafiamerch.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 20, 2025. On November 20, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 20, 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 ("Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf") and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 21, 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 amendment to the Complaint on November 21, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 25, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 15, 2025. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on November 25, 2025. The Center commenced the panel appointment process on December 17, 2025.

The Center appointed Willem J. H. Leppink as the sole panelist in this matter on December 19, 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 following facts are undisputed.

The Complainant, based in the United Kingdom, holds the registered trademarks for the music group Swedish House Mafia. Swedish House Mafia was founded in 2008 and has been nominated for two Grammy awards and ten International Dance Music Awards. Their two top songs “Don’t You Worry Child – Radio Edit” and “Moth To A Flame (with the Weekend) have rendered 1.37 billion and 1.27 billion streams on Spotify.

The Complainant owns, inter alia, an International trademark registration for the word mark SWEDISH HOUSE MAFIA with registration number 1411736 and a registration date of April 3, 2018 and a priority date of January 8, 2018), designating, inter alia the United States (registration number 5724363), registered for goods and services in classes 9, 25 and 41, in particular shirts, sweaters and disc jockey services.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 30, 2024. At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website containing images of Swedish House Mafia and information concerning Swedish House Mafia. On the web page “Where Can I Buy Swedish House Mafia Merch” there is a link to a web shop with goods featuring art associated with Swedish House Mafia. As such the website to which the disputed domain name resolves claims to be an “Official Store” selling genuine merchandise for Swedish House Mafia through a linked online web shop.

A cease and desist letter has been sent to both the Registrar and the Respondent (through the anonymized privacy email address listed in the Whois record).

At the time of decision, the disputed domain name resolved to a parked page of the hosting provider cPanel L.L.C. On this web page the registrant is invited to contact the hosting provider directly because either the IP address has changed, there has been a server misconfiguration and/or the website was moved to a different server.

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 the following.

The Complainant’s trademark registration for SWEDISH HOUSE MAFIA predates the dispute domain name by many years. The Complainant has a widespread and continuous use of the SWEDISH HOUSE MAFIA trademark for nearly two decades and would be immediately recognizable among the trade and consumers in connection with music services and related goods.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark. The disputed domain name incorporates the Trademark in its entirety. The addition of the descriptive term “merch” does not change the overall impression and does not make the disputed domain name any less confusingly similar to the Trademark.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name and the website is not authorized by the Complainant. Moreover, Respondent is not affiliated with Complainant and is also not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Further to the above, the Respondent is not making a legitimate, noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Quite to the contrary, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to set up a false and unauthorized website purporting to be an official merchandise website for the Swedish House Mafia. However, at no time has the Complainant ever licensed or authorized the Respondent to use the Trademark. The web shop to which the website links offers knock-off goods by using the Trademark on products, such as T-shirts and sweaters.

In light of the fact that the Respondent falsely claims to be the official merchandise website for Swedish House Mafia, the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. This is strengthened by the fact that the Respondent is offering counterfeit goods. In doing so, the Respondent is also disrupting the legitimate business of the Complainant.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not submit a formal Response. However, on November 25, 2025, the Respondent replied to the Complainant's contentions through an e-mail in which the Respondent mentioned that it was not aware of any trademark or intellectual property issues associated with the content previously hosted on the website to which the disputed domain name resolved. Upon receiving the notification, the Respondent claimed to have immediately removed all content and disabled any associated storefront. According to the Respondent, the website to which the disputed domain name resolved was made inactive and contained no material related to the Complainant. The Respondent further stated that it had no intention of using the disputed domain name in a manner that would infringe upon any trademarks or intellectual property rights.

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 confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, the term "merch" 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 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 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.

UDRP panels have also found that domain names identical to a complainant’s trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation and that even where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term, here “merch” (which is an abbreviation for merchandise) this cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. The Panel finds that this is certainly the case here and that this is emphasized by the overall impression the website creates, i.e. that it gives the impression of being the official merchandising website of the music group the Swedish House Mafia. Moreover, it was not rebutted by the Respondent that the links on the website led to websites where counterfeit products were offered.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, as claimed, sale of counterfeit goods and 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has clearly attempted to impersonate the Complainant and purports to be the official merchandise website of the Swedish House Mafia. As such, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity as described above constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, which includes the fact that the Respondent failed to reply to both the cease and desist letter and the substantiated allegations made by the Complainant but notably removed the website to which the disputed domain name used to resolve, 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 <swedishhousemafiamerch.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Willem J. H. Leppink/

Willem J. H. Leppink

Sole Panelist

Date: January 2, 2026