

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bokusgruppen AB v. Walker CJ
Case No. D2025-5064

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Bokusgruppen AB, Sweden, represented by Valea AB trading as Rouse AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Walker CJ, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <akademibokhandeln-se.com> is registered with West263 International Limited (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 5, 2025. On December 5, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 10, 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 FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 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 amendment to the Complaint on December 15, 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 December 16, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 5, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Aaron Newell as the sole panelist in this matter on January 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 market-leading retailer in Sweden. It is publicly-traded on the Nasdaq First North Premier Growth Market.

The Complainant uses the trademark AKADEMIBOKHANDELN in respect of retail services (both in-store and online at “www.akademibokhandeln.se”) for books, games, toys, stationery and products for arts and crafts. Its AKADEMIBOKHANDELN trademark has been in use for over fifty years with its first retail outlet having opened in 1971. Presently the Complainant operates 95 retail outlets throughout Sweden. These are supported by approximately 400 employees, and are estimated by the Complainant to be visited approximately 15 million times per year.

The Complainant has protected its AKADEMIBOKHANDELN name with multiple trademark registrations, including Sweden trademark registration no 500718 for the mark AKADEMIBOKHANDELN in classes 9, 16, 28, 30, 35, 41, 43 (word mark, registered on September 23, 2011) and Sweden trademark registration no 500719 for the mark A AKADEMIBOKHANDELN in classes 9, 16, 28, 30, 35, 41, 43 (logo, registered on September 23, 2011).

The disputed domain name was registered on November 13, 2025. The evidence shows that prior to the filing of the Complaint the disputed domain name loaded a website that resembled the Complainant’s official website at “www.akademibokhandeln.se”, featured the Complainant’s AKADEMIBOKHANDELN trademark throughout, and purported to offer identical products to those offered by the Complainant, often at discounted prices.

The Complainant asserts and provides supporting evidence that on December 1, 2025 it filed a complaint with the relevant Registrar in order to have the website disabled. At the time the Complaint was filed the disputed domain name did not load any content, and this remains its status at the time of writing this decision.

There is no indication in the case file that the Parties have engaged in correspondence with each other, nor any indication that the Respondent has engaged with the Center in respect of these proceedings.

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:

- i) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its registered trademarks because the disputed domain name contains the entirety of its trademark AKADEMIBOKHANDELN, the inclusion of the term “se” is a reference to Sweden which is where the Complainant operates and is well known, and there are no factors that might distinguish the disputed domain name from its registered trademark rights;
- ii) the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because the Respondent used the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant and has not used it for a bona fide offering of goods and/or services, the Respondent is not affiliated or related to the Complainant in any

way or licensed or otherwise authorized to use the Complainant's AKADEMIBOKHANDELN trademark, the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with any legitimate noncommercial or fair use without intent for commercial gain, and the Respondent is not generally known by the disputed domain name and has not acquired any trademark or service mark rights in the disputed domain name or the AKADEMIBOKHANDELN trademark;

iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith because the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its AKADEMIBOKHANDELN trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain name and intentionally registered a domain name that was confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, the Respondent used the disputed domain name to load a website that was similar to the Complainant's website and purported to offer identical products often at discounted prices, the Respondent has accordingly intentionally attempted to attract Internet traffic for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark AKADEMIBOKHANDELN, and the Respondent undertook the aforesaid conduct while using a privacy service to mask its identity.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions and did not engage with the Center or these proceedings.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant carries the burden of proving:

- i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which it has rights;
- ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Respondent's default does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant.

Paragraph 5(f) of the Rules does however provide that if the Respondent does not submit a Response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute solely based upon the Complaint.

Further, according to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences from the Respondent's failure to submit a Response as it considers appropriate.

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 Complainant's 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 the term “-se” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of this 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.

Further, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity (here claimed to be the intentionally-confusing imitation of the Complainant’s business) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Again, the Respondent has not engaged with the proceedings and has not rebutted the Complainant’s allegations and related supporting evidence in respect of the Respondent’s conduct.

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.

As noted above, the Complainant has asserted and provided compelling evidence that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to imitate and/or impersonate the Complainant and mislead consumers by creating the impression that the Respondent’s website at the disputed domain name is the Complainant’s website, or is connected with the Complainant, when it is not.

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.

The use of a domain name for per se illegitimate activity such as the intentional impersonation of the complainant and/or conduct that is intended to mislead or deceive consumers can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. Such behavior is manifestly considered evidence of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

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 <akademibokhandeln-se.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Aaron Newell/

Aaron Newell

Sole Panelist

Date: February 1, 2026