

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bunge SA v. For Tunch, Dream Health Markt  
Case No. D2025-4847

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Bunge SA, Switzerland, represented by 101domain.com, United States of America (“United States” or “US”).

The Respondent is For Tunch, United States; and Dream Health Markt, United States.

### 2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <bunge-bv.com> and <bunge-nl.com> are registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (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 24, 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 Respondent (Information not available in the Domain Registration Database, REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 5, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all disputed domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on December 12, 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 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on January 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Shwetasree Majumder as the sole panelist in this matter on January 20, 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, Bunge SA, is the trademark-holding entity of the Bunge Group, a globally recognised multinational enterprise operating in the agriculture and food processing sector. The Complainant is active in agricultural commodities, food ingredients, grain handling, oilseed processing, fertilisers, and related supply-chain services. The Complainant operates approximately 300 facilities across more than 40 countries and employs over 23,000 employees worldwide. The Complainant also became a publicly listed corporation in 2001.

The Complainant owns and uses the mark BUNGE for its products and services. The Complainant holds multiple trademark registrations for its BUNGE mark, and details of some of such registrations are as below:

- BUNGE – US Registration No. 2036787, registered on February 11, 1997, in international class 29.
- BÜNGE – US Registration No. 2682681, registered on February 4, 2003, in international classes 35, 36, 39, 40, and 42.
- BUNGE – European Union Intellectual Property Office (“EUIPO”) Registration No. 003966595, registered on February 13, 2006, in international classes 4, 5, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 39, and 40.

The Complainant's primary corporate website is “[www.bunge.com](http://www.bunge.com)”, which was created in the year 1996. In addition, the Complainant owns and controls an extensive portfolio of domain names incorporating the BUNGE mark, including numerous country-code and generic Top-Level Domain registrations.

The disputed domain name <bunge-nl.com> was registered on April 21, 2025. The Complainant filed an abuse complaint with the Registrar of this disputed domain name on July 4, 2025, and this disputed domain name was subsequently suspended on July 5, 2025. Shortly thereafter, the disputed domain name <bunge-bv.com> was registered on July 7, 2025. The disputed domain names do not resolve to any active website, however, the evidence provided by the Complainant shows that they have been used for sending fraudulent emails.

#### **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 identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's registered trademark BUNGE. The Complainant states that the disputed domain names incorporate the BUNGE trademark in its entirety, with the addition of a hyphen and the geographical or corporate identifiers “nl” and “bv,” which do not dispel the confusing similarity and instead increases the likelihood of confusion.

The Complainant contends that it holds a global portfolio of registered trademarks for BUNGE, including registrations in the United States and international registrations with protection in the European Union and the Netherlands (Kingdom of the). The Complainant submits that the BUNGE mark has been used extensively for several decades and has acquired significant goodwill and worldwide recognition in connection with the Complainant's agricultural and food processing business.

The Complainant further highlights its substantial global presence, noting that the Bunge Group was founded in 1818, operates approximately 300 facilities in more than 40 countries, and employs over 23,000 employees worldwide, thereby demonstrating the widespread reputation associated with the BUNGE trademark.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Complainant submits that the Respondent is not commonly known by the name "Bunge," and has not been authorised, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the BUNGE trademark. The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent has not made any bona fide or legitimate noncommercial use of the disputed domain names. The Complainant further argues that the disputed domain names were used to impersonate the Complainant and its Netherlands subsidiary through fraudulent email communications sent from addresses such as [...]@bunge-nl.com and [...]@bunge-bv.com, thereby misleading customers and business partners.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Complainant submits that the Respondent deliberately registered the disputed domain names with knowledge of the Complainant and its BUNGE trademark and used them as part of an impersonation and phishing scheme to solicit payments from the Complainant's customers. The Complainant further contends that the registration of <bunge-bv.com> shortly after the suspension of <bunge-nl.com>, the use of identical email formats, contact details, and fraudulent conduct demonstrate bad-faith registration and use under the Policy.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **Consolidation: Multiple Disputed Domain Name Registrants**

In addressing the consolidation of multiple disputed domain name registrants, 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.

The Complainant asserts in its email dated December 12, 2025, that the disputed domain names were registered and are controlled by the same individual or entity, notwithstanding the differing Whois information. This assertion is supported by the evidence, which shows that fraudulent communications were sent from the email addresses associated with the disputed domain names using the same term before "@". The Panel finds that the content of these fraudulent emails is nearly identical including the used address and WhatsApp number, and these emails have impersonated the same employee of the Complainant and the same company affiliated with the Complainant, which further demonstrates common control of the disputed domain names. Moreover, the close temporal sequence between the suspension of the first disputed domain name and the registration of the second disputed domain name further supports the inference of a single underlying Respondent.

Based on the above, the Panel agrees that the disputed domain names are subject to the common control. As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

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

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants in a single proceeding.

#### **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 names. [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 names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are identical and confusingly similar 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 with 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, such as impersonation of the Complainant, phishing, or fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Panel finds that the disputed domain names were registered for operating a fraudulent impersonation scheme. In particular, the Respondent used email addresses such as "[...]"@bunge-nl.com" and "[...]"@bunge-bv.com" to pose as the representative of the Complainant and its subsidiary in the Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Bunge Loders Croklaan BV.

The record further shows that these emails contained the Complainant's trademark, logo, and employee information, and were used to transmit false invoices and payment requests to the Complainant's customers, thereby seeking to induce recipients to remit payments under the mistaken belief that the communications originated from the Complainant. The Respondent also used the telephone number associated with WhatsApp account to reinforce the deception. Such use of the disputed domain names constitutes clear impersonation, phishing and fraud, which panels have consistently held can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.

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 disputed domain names have been registered and used in a manner that clearly targets the Complainant and its BUNGE mark. The Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with knowledge of the Complainant and intentionally sought to create a likelihood of confusion by incorporating the Complainant's trademark with corporate and geographic identifiers closely associated with the Complainant's operations in the Netherlands (Kingdom of the).

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.

Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, including impersonation, phishing and fraud, constitutes evidence of bad faith registration and use. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. This is squarely applicable in the present case as the disputed domain names were actively used to send fraudulent email communications to the Complainant's customers for the purpose of obtaining money.

The Panel further notes that the registration of <bunge-bv.com> shortly after the suspension of <bunge-nl.com>, and the continuation of the same fraudulent scheme by using <bunge-nl.com> strongly indicate a deliberate attempt by the Respondent to continue the misuse of the Complainant's trademark.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of 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 <bunge-bv.com> and <bunge-nl.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Shwetasree Majumder/

**Shwetasree Majumder**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 3, 2026