

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

SSAB Technology AB v. Pro Web, Pro Web Solution

Case No. D2025-5195

### **1. The Parties**

Complainant is SSAB Technology AB, Sweden, represented by Suryomurcito & Co., Indonesia.

Respondent is Pro Web, Pro Web Solution, Indonesia.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <jualplathardoxjakarta.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Web Commerce Communications Limited dba WebNic.cc (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 12, 2025. On December 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On December 13, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, confirming that Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing contact details.

The Center verified that 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 13, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on January 14, 2026.

The Center appointed Kimberley Chen Nobles 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**

Complainant, organized under the laws of Sweden, is a wholly owned subsidiary of SSAB AB and a member of the SSAB Group of companies. Complainant's parent company, SSAB AB (Svenskt Stål AB, meaning "Swedish Steel" in English), was formed in 1978. Complainant specializes in steel production and services, with approximately 14,500 employees in over 50 countries. Complainant's production facilities are located in Sweden, Finland and the United States of America ("U.S."). Complainant has smaller production sites and steel service centers located around the world, including a finishing line in Shanghai, China, for customers in Asia and steel service centers in the Nordic countries and Baltic states. Complainant's production plants in Sweden, Finland and the U.S. have an annual steel production capacity of approximately 8.8 million tons. In 2024, Complainant earned over SEK 100 billion.

Complainant owns numerous registered trademarks for the HARDOX mark globally, including:

- Canadian registered trademark number TMA318733 for the HARDOX word mark, registered on September 19, 1986;
- Japanese registered trademark number 4161996 for the HARDOX word mark, registered on July 3, 1998; and
- Indonesian registered trademark number IDM000202589 for the HARDOX word mark, registered on May 1, 2009.

Complainant also owns the <hardox.com> domain name, registered on November 4, 1996, and operates it as Complainant's official website.

The Domain Name was registered on August 15, 2023, and at the time of the filing of the Complaint, it resolved to a website of a steel distributor company in Indonesia, named PT. Sriwijaya Wardhana Group, which claims to be a distributor of building materials, including Complainant's, and claims to sell HARDOX steel plates in Jakarta. The website also features and offers other products for sale.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

Complainant contends that (i) the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks; (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

In particular, Complainant contends that it has trademark registrations for HARDOX, and that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name with the intention to confuse Internet users looking for bona fide and well-known HARDOX products and services.

Complainant notes that it has no affiliation with Respondent, that Respondent is using the Domain Name as a tool to exploit Complainant's reputation for its own commercial gain, and that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the registration and use of the Domain Name. Further, Complainant contends that Respondent has acted in bad faith in registering and setting up the Domain Name, when Respondent clearly knew of Complainant's rights.

##### **B. Respondent**

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

## 6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

To prevail, Complainant has to establish the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy by a preponderance of the evidence.

### A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Ownership of a trademark registration is generally sufficient evidence that a complainant has the requisite rights in a mark for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 1.2.1. Complainant has provided evidence of its rights in the HARDOX trademarks, as noted above under section 4. Complainant has therefore proven that it has the requisite rights in the HARDOX trademarks.

With Complainant's rights in the HARDOX trademarks established, the remaining question under the first element of the Policy is whether the Domain Name, typically disregarding the generic Top-Level Domain in which the respective Domain Name is registered (in this case, “.com”), is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks. See, e.g., *B & H Foto & Electronics Corp. v. Domains by Proxy, Inc. / Joseph Gross*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-0842](#).

Here, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant's HARDOX trademark. The HARDOX trademark is recognizable in the Domain Name.

In particular, the Domain Name's inclusion of Complainant's HARDOX trademark in its entirety, with an addition of the terms “jual” – which means “sell” in Indonesian and “plat” – which means “plate” in Indonesian, preceding the trademark HARDOX, and the term “Jakarta”, the capital of Indonesia, following the trademark HARDOX in the Domain Name, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the HARDOX trademarks. See section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

Thus, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied the first element of the Policy.

### B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, a complainant must make a *prima facie* showing that a respondent possesses no rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. See, e.g., *Malayan Banking Berhad v. Beauty, Success & Truth International*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-1393](#). Once a complainant makes out such a *prima facie* showing, the burden of production shifts to the respondent, though the burden of proof always remains on the complainant. If the respondent fails to come forward with relevant evidence showing rights or legitimate interests, the complainant will have sustained its burden under the second element of the UDRP. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Complainant asserts that Respondent is not authorized to promote Complainant's goods or services and is not related to Complainant. Respondent is also not known to be associated with the HARDOX trademarks and there is no evidence showing that Respondent has been commonly known by the Domain Name, or has acquired trademark or service mark rights in the Domain Name.

In addition, Respondent has not used the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Rather, at the time of filing of the Complaint, the Domain Name resolved to a website of a steel distributor company in Indonesia, named PT. Sriwijaya Wardhana Group, which claims to be a distributor of building materials, including Complainant's, and claims to sell HARDOX plates in Jakarta. The website also features and offers other unrelated products for sale.

Moreover, the Domain Name includes Complainant's trademark HARDOX, with the terms "jual plat" (meaning "selling plate") and "Jakarta" (the capital of Indonesia) and is inherently misleading and carries a risk of implied affiliation. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. Such composition of the Domain Name, implying that Respondent is "Selling Plate HARDOX Jarkarta" by an Indonesian company coupled with the manner in which the Domain Name has been used, affirms Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the Domain Name and Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website at the Domain Name, which does not confer rights or legitimate interests on Respondent. Respondent had also claimed it is a distributor of Complainant's products, while Complainant had submitted that it is not affiliated with Respondent, particularly that Respondent is neither licensed nor authorized to sell Complainant's HARDOX goods. Furthermore, Respondent has not disclosed on its website its lack of relationship with Complainant and has used Complainant's mark in the Domain Name seemingly to offer for sale other third-party products.

Accordingly, Complainant has provided evidence supporting its *prima facie* claim that Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Respondent has failed to produce countervailing evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name to rebut Complainant's *prima facie* case.

Thus, the Panel concludes that Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, and Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Panel finds that Respondent's actions indicate that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances indicating bad faith registration and use on the part of a domain name registrant, namely:

"(i) circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) you have registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your web site or location or of a product or service on your web site or location."

From the record in this case, it is evident that Respondent was aware of Complainant and its HARDOX trademarks when registering the Domain Name. The Panel finds that Complainant has provided ample evidence to show that the registrations of the HARDOX trademarks well predate the registration of the

Domain Name. Complainant is also well established and known. Indeed, the record shows that Complainant's HARDOX trademarks and related products and services are widely known and recognized.

Therefore, the Panel is of the view that Respondent was aware of the HARDOX trademarks when it registered the Domain Name. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2; see also *TTT Moneycorp Limited v. Privacy Gods / Privacy Gods Limited*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1973](#).

In particular, the registration of the Domain Name incorporating Complainant's HARDOX trademark in its entirety and the use to which the Domain Name has been put suggests Respondent's actual knowledge of Complainant's rights in the HARDOX trademarks at the time of registration of the Domain Name and its effort to opportunistically capitalize on the reputation of Complainant's mark. Further, UDRP panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. See section 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#)

It is more likely than not that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name to confuse and mislead consumers looking for well-known HARDOX products and services of Complainant or authorized partners of Complainant. The use of the HARDOX trademark in the Domain Name is intended to capture Internet traffic from Internet users who are looking for Complainant's products and services. The use of the Domain Name to divert users to a website featuring and promoting the sale of Complainant's HARDOX products, displaying Complainant's trademarks, as well as promoting other unrelated products, while falsely claiming to be a distributor of Complainant, by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's mark - is in bad faith.

Essentially, by using the Domain Name, Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users looking for bona fide and well-known HARDOX products and services of Complainant or authorized partners of Complainant to Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's HARDOX mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent's website.

Finally, the Panel also notes the reputation of the HARDOX trademarks, and the failure of Respondent to submit a response to the Complaint or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use. Accordingly, the Panel finds that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith and Complainant succeeds under the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 Domain Name <jualplathardoxjakarta.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Kimberley Chen Nobles/  
**Kimberley Chen Nobles**  
Sole Panelist  
Date: January 28, 2026