

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SAMSON Aktiengesellschaft v. سعید خلیلی CO  
Case No. D2025-5239

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is SAMSON Aktiengesellschaft, Germany, represented by BOEHMERT & BOEHMERT Anwaltspartnerschaft mbB, Germany.

The Respondent is سعید خلیلی, co, Tajikistan.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <samsonworldgroup.com> 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 16, 2025. On December 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 17, 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 (Whoisprotection.cc.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 17, 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 17, 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 19, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Nayiri Boghossian 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 is a German control valve manufacturer founded in 1907. The Complainant promotes its business at “samsongroup.com”. The Complainant owns trademark registrations for SAMSON such as:

- German trademark registration No. 108039, registered on May 30, 1908;
- International trademark registration No. 382584, registered on July 29, 1971.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 20, 2023 and resolves to a website which impersonates the Complainant and purports to offer the Complainant's products and competing products.

#### **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 the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark in an identical manner together with the non-distinctive terms “group” and “world”. As the Complainant operates under the company name “SAMSON Group”, the Respondent has only added the geographical indication “world”. The Respondent's website displays the Complainant's trademarks several times. The generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com” may be disregarded.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not authorized by the Complainant to use its trademark or register the disputed domain name. The Complainant's trademark rights date back to as early as 1908. There is no evidence of bona fide use. The Respondent is not making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is attempting to obtain unfair commercial gain. The *Oki Data* test requirements are not met in the instant case.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent aims to attract customers who believe that the Complainant is responsible for the Respondent's website. The Respondent's website displays the Complainant's trademarks together with an image of the Complainant's headquarters taken from the latter's website and where the SAMSON logo is prominently displayed. The Respondent is attempting to mislead Internet users. The Respondent knew of the Complainant's trademark.

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

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

## 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, "group" and "world" 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. Even if there could be an argument that the Respondent is offering the Complainant's products or services related thereto, the requirements of the *Oki Data* test have not been met in this case.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed 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 was aware of the Complainant's business as the disputed domain name resolves to a website, which displays the Complainant's trademark together with an image of the Complainant's headquarters taken from the latter's website and where the SAMSON logo is prominently displayed. The website also mentions the Complainant's address and purports to offer the Complainant's products. Additionally, the Complainant's trademark existed for more than a century by the time the disputed domain name was registered. The website also offers competing products.

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 held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed impersonation/passing off 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 name constitutes 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 <samsonworldgroup.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Nayiri Boghossian/*

**Nayiri Boghossian**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 23, 2026