

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ABB Asea Brown Boveri Ltd. v. fa fa, Hong Kong, China
Case No. D2025-4845

1. The Parties

The Complainant is ABB Asea Brown Boveri Ltd., Switzerland, represented by Taylor Wessing Partnerschaftsgesellschaft mbB, Germany.

The Respondent is fa fa, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names are <abb-e-mob.cc>, <abb-e-mob.com> and <abb-e-mob.org>, registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 21, 2025. On November 21, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On November 21, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names, which differed from the named Respondent (“Domains by Proxy, LLC, DomainsByProxy.com”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 24, 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 24, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint, together with its amendment 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 26, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for the Response was December 16, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 17, 2025.

The Center appointed Ada L. Redondo Aguilera 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 ABB Asea Brown Boveri Ltd. is part of ABB Group, a worldwide leading group of companies, operating in the field of power and automation technology with over 100000 employees in over 100 countries worldwide.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous ABB trademark registrations, including:

The International Trademark Registration for ABB (figurative) No. 781902, registered on March 27, 2002;

The International Trademark Registration for ABB (word) No. 781685, registered on March 27, 2002;

European Union Trademark Registration for ABB (word) No. 002629673, registered on December 21, 2006;

European Union Trademark Registration for ABB (word/device) No. 002628964, registered on November 21, 2003.

The Complainant is also the owner of domain names such as <abb.com>, <global.abb> and the subdomain <e-mobility.abb.com>, which incorporate the ABB trademark and are used as official domain names to promote its products and services.

These include, for example, products from the areas of high, medium, and low voltage, industrial automation, and comprehensive services in these areas. The Complainant is using its famous ABB device trademark in connection with its products and on its website.

The disputed domain names were all registered on October 31, 2025. They resolved to identical websites prominently displaying the ABB trademark and logo, stating “ABB E-mobility is a business unit of ABB Group,” and offering purported investment or reward schemes related to electric vehicle charging and digital assets.

The evidence presented in this case shows that the websites displayed by the disputed domain names are reproducing the Complainant's trademark, and contain false corporate information and display counterfeit certificates allegedly issued by an ABB subsidiary. At the time of rendering this Decision, the disputed domain names do not resolve to an active site.

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 disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the ABB trademark, notwithstanding the inclusion of the additional term “e-mob”. It is asserted that this addition of the term “e-mob” is insufficient to render the disputed domain names distinct from the ABB trademark, since the descriptive term relates to the Complainant's services or products.

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

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed in its Complaint, the Complainant is required to establish the following elements set out under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy: (a) that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; (b) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and (c) that the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of another term like "e-mob" in the disputed domain names may bear on the 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 purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Furthermore, the Panel finds that the generic Top-Level Domains (gTLDs) ".com" and ".org", used in the disputed domain names <abb-e-mob.com> and <abb-e-mob.org>, and the country code Top-level Domain ("ccTLD") in the present case ".cc" included in the disputed domain name <abb-e-mob.cc>, can 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 3.0](#), 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 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 disputed 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.

There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain names or the Complainant's trademark, nor that the Respondent has been authorized by the Complainant to use the ABB trademark. The use of the disputed domain names for websites falsely purporting to be associated with the Complainant, and offering fraudulent schemes, cannot constitute a *bona fide* offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

The Complainant has also established a *prima facie* case that the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondent is not a licensee or affiliate of ABB and has not been authorized to use the ABB mark. There is no indication that the Respondent, whose name is "fa fa" based on information disclosed by the Registrar, is commonly known by any of the domain names or associated with the ABB trademarks. More importantly, the disputed domain names are used for an illegitimate purpose, namely to impersonate the Complainant and facilitate fraud, which cannot constitute *bona fide* or fair use. UDRP panels have uniformly held that the use of a domain name for illegal or deceptive activities (such as phishing, counterfeit sales, or other types of fraud) certainly does not confer rights or legitimate interests on a Respondent. Here, the disputed domain names direct to websites that are clearly engaged in deceptive investment schemes and counterfeit credentials. In the absence of any response or evidence from the Respondent (and given the illegal nature of the use), the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

Furthermore, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain names incorporating the Complainant trademark and being very similar to the Complainant's subdomain carries a risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

For the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the Panel notes that paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be considered evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

Given the worldwide fame of the ABB trademark, the Panel finds it inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant at the time of registration of the disputed domain names. The deliberate incorporation of the ABB trademark, combined with references to e-mobility and the reproduction of the Complainant's logo and branding, in the disputed domain names, demonstrate clear targeting of the Complainant.

The Panel finds that the registration of three domain names on the same date, all resolving to identical infringing websites, further evidences a coordinated scheme and reinforces the finding of bad faith.

The evidence further shows that the Respondent used the disputed domain names to impersonate the Complainant and its subsidiary, falsely claiming corporate affiliation and displaying counterfeit certificates.

Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for impersonation, phishing, or other fraudulent schemes constitutes bad faith.

Panels have sustained that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activities here, claimed as applicable to this case, impersonation/passing off, and fraud, 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 constitute bad faith under the Policy.

By creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's famous mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites, the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain.

First, the disputed domain names were registered after the ABB trademark became famous, and each incorporates the ABB mark in full. It is inconceivable that the registrant was unaware of the Complainant's well-known rights. Second, the disputed domain names resolved to a fraudulent website that intentionally mimicked the Complainant's official online presence, expressly to attract Internet users into a bogus ABB E-Mobility scheme. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy identifies as bad faith the use of a domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's trademarks.

Given the current circumstances in this case, including the fraudulent content of the websites and the Respondent's deliberate impersonation of the Complainant, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names were all registered and have been used in bad faith. The fact that the disputed domain names are presently inactive does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

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 <abb-e-mob.cc>, <abb-e-mob.com> and <abb-e-mob.org> be transferred to the Complainant

/Ada L. Redondo Aguilera/
Ada L. Redondo Aguilera
Sole Panelist
Date: January 12, 2026