

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Mölnlycke Health Care AB v. Qingqing Yu
Case No. D2025-5331

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Mölnlycke Health Care AB, Sweden, represented by Abion AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Qingqing Yu, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <molnlycke.store> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 19, 2025. On December 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 22, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 23, 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 amended Complaint on December 26, 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 29, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 18, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Christos A. Theodoulou as the sole panelist in this matter on January 22, 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 Mölnlycke Health Care AB is a limited liability company registered under the laws of Sweden. It is a world-leading medical solutions company, specializing in, inter alia, wound care and surgical procedures. The company was founded in 1849 in Sweden, now it is a leading medtech company employing round 8,600 people. Its products and solutions are used daily by hospitals, healthcare providers and patients in over 100 countries around the world, always according to the uncontested allegations of the Complainant.

The Complainant is the owner of multiple trademark registrations for MOLNLYCKE and MÖLNLYCKE:

- Swedish trademark registration MOLNLYCKE (word) registered under no. 280233 on June 22, 1961.
- Australian trademark registration MOLNLYCKE (word) registered under no. 1316246 on June 22, 1971.
- European Union trademark registration MÖLNLYCKE (word) registered under no. 005357082 on September 15, 1999.
- International trademark registration MÖLNLYCKE (word) registered under no. 1760848 on July 3, 2023.
- International trademark registration MÖLNLYCKE (word) registered under no. 1230528 on June 18, 2014.
- International trademark registration MÖLNLYCKE (word) registered under no. 535845A on March 8, 1989.
- United States of America trademark registration MÖLNLYCKE (word) registered under no. 4957769 on May 17, 2016.

The disputed domain name <molnlycke.store> was created on November 13, 2025, that is after the registration of the Complainant's trademarks. The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website.

The Complainant, according to his uncontested allegations, owns numerous domain names comprising its trademark MOLNLYCKE including but not limited to <molnlycke.com> (created on September 22, 1996), <molnlycke.shop> (created on March 27, 2025), <molnlycke.global> (created on February 4, 2019), <molnlycke.kids> (created on November 29, 2022) and <molnlycke.net> (created on January 11, 2001).

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 its trademarks MOLNLYCKE and MÖLNLYCKE in which the Complainant has rights, that the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name after the Complainant registered its trademarks and has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Moreover, the Complainant alleges that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, that the Respondent has no relation to the Complainant in any way. The Complainant further alleges that the Respondent was neither licensed nor authorized to make any use of the Complainant's trademark MOLNLYCKE.

The Complainant asserts that, the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant's trademarks were registered and used by the Complainant long before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

The Panel shall now proceed to the analysis of the evidence in this case and shall decide if the Complainant has satisfied the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

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 MOLNLYCKE and MÖLNLYCKE trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the MOLNLYCKE mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 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.

In particular and based on the available record, the Panel finds that the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services; that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name; and that the Respondent has not made a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Moreover, it is to be noted that the Respondent did not present evidence of any license or permission by the Complainant, with whom there seems to exist no relationship whatsoever.

In addition, the Panel notes that the composition of the disputed domain name, incorporating the Complainant's distinctive trademark in its entirety, carries a high risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Further, the Complainant sent a cease and desist letter to the Respondent and twice tried to contact him but received no response, according to the uncontested allegations of the Complainant.

As a conclusion on this point, the Panel finds that 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's disputed domain name was created on November 13, 2025, whereas the Complainant's trademarks had already been registered. From the evidence at hand, the Panel finds that the Respondent, when registering the disputed domain name, must have been aware of the Complainant's trademarks. Therefore, the Respondent's awareness of the Complainant's trademark rights at the time of registration suggests bad faith (See, *BellSouth Intellectual Property Corporation v. Serena, Axel*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0007](#), *Red Bull GmbH v. Credit du Léman SA, Jean-Denis Deletraz*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-2209](#)).

Further, the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's MOLNLYCKE trademark and this, according to previous UDRP cases, evidences bad faith registration and use (See *Charles Jourdan Holding AG v. AAIM*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0403](#), [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.)

It was found that the disputed domain name was passively held. According to previous panels "the non-use of a domain would not prevent a finding of bad faith" (See *Mölnlycke Health Care AB v. Jawd Khan*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-2375](#), [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3). Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy. Further, according to the uncontested allegations of the Complainant, it sent a cease and desist letter to the Respondent, to which the Respondent did not answer to prove possible good faith. At the time of filing the Complaint, according to the uncontested allegations of the Complainant, the disputed domain name still resolved to an inactive page. There is, therefore, no evidence of any actual or contemplated good faith use of the disputed domain name, as previous panels held (see *British Airways Plc v. David Moor*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-1224](#)).

As a consequence of the above, 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 <molnlycke.store> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Christos A. Theodoulou/

Christos A. Theodoulou

Sole Panelist

Date: January 27, 2026