ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
VDA Verband der Automobilindustrie e.V. v. Adblu Technology
Case No. D2026-0210

1. The Parties

The Complainant is VDA Verband der Automobilindustrie e.V., Germany, represented by Kroher Strobel Rechts- und Patentanwälte PartmbB, Germany.

The Respondent is Adblu Technology, India, represented by Preferus, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <adblutech.com> 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 January 19, 2026. On January 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 20, 2026, 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 January 21, 2026, 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 January 22, 2026.

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 January 29, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 18, 2026. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on February 17, 2026 and March 26, 2026. The proceeding was suspended until March 27, 2026, and April 29, 2026, on the Complainant's request for purposes of settlement discussions concerning the disputed domain name. However, the proceeding was reinstituted on May 15,

2026 and the due date for the Response was May 22, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any formal Response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Commencement of Panel Appointment Process on June 2, 2026.

The Center appointed Peter Burgstaller as the sole panelist in this matter on June 8, 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.

On June 15, 2026 the Respondent sent another email correspondence to the Center.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is an interest group of the German automotive industry, including both automobile manufacturers and automobile component suppliers (Annex 11 to the Complaint). It owns numerous trademark registrations containing and/or consisting of the mark ADBLUE, inter alia

- European Union Trade Mark registration, No. 003945938, registered February 6, 2006;

- Indian trademark registration, No. 1368315, registered July 1, 2005;

- International trademark registration, No. 1208573, registered May 23, 2014, designated in several jurisdictions around the world (Annexes 5 – 8 and 10).

The disputed domain name was registered on July 6, 2024 (Annex 2 to the Complaint). At the time of filing the Complaint the disputed domain name resolved to a website with information about AdBlue production systems and offering AdBlue goods for the reduction of NOx emissions in vehicles, displaying the ADBLUE registered trademark of the Complainant (Annex 1 to the Complaint).

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a cancellation of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that it is the holder of numerous trademark registrations for ADBLUE around the world and the disputed domain name is composed of a sign nearly identical to the ADBLUE trademark and the non-distinctive term "tech". The mere missing of the letter "e" leads to a phonetically identic pronunciation and a highly similar typeface. The one letter difference in the exclusion of the silent "e" does not oppose the confusing similarity.

Further, the Complainant contends that the ADBLUE mark is famous and well-known around the world.

The Complainant moreover alleges that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, it was not authorized by the Complainant to use the ADBLUE mark and the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name – it is the contrary: The disputed domain name is used to host website offering identical goods, i.e. urea solution for the reduction of NOx emissions in vehicles and pretending to have a connection with the Complainant which is not the case.

Finally, the Complainant argues, that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith and the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith. The ADBLUE trademark of the Complainant is well known and was registered as trademark long before of the registration of the disputed domain name. Moreover, the disputed domain name is used by the Respondent to resolve to a website where urea solutions for the reduction of NOx emissions in vehicles were offered. In doing so, the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website.

B. Respondent

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

However, the Respondent sent email communications to the Center on February 17, 2026, March 26, 2026 and June 15, 2026 arguing especially that the website has been removed from the disputed domain name, and all product listings associated with the disputed domain name, and Complainant's mark have been removed from various marketplaces. Moreover, the Respondent indicated that it had not intended to reference, target, or take advantage of the Complainant's mark, and that it consented to the remedy requested by the Complainant.

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

As an initial matter, the Panel notes that the Respondent consented to the remedy requested by the Complainant, but the Parties were unable to finalize a settlement as provided in paragraph 17 of the Rules. Noting the composition and use of the disputed domain name, as well as the Respondent's limited and unsupported claims not to have targeted the Complainant's mark, the Panel finds it appropriate to proceed to a substantive decision on the merits. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.10.

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 3.1, section 1.7.

The Complainant submitted evidence which incontestably and conclusively establishes rights in the mark ADBLUE.

In the present case, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the ADBLUE mark in which the Complainant has rights since that mark remains recognizable within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name only omits the letter "e" in the word "blue" which is a common, obvious, and intentional misspelling of the Complainant's trademark and adds the descriptive term "tech"; the disputed domain name is therefore considered to be confusingly similar to the ADBLUE mark of the Complainant. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 1.8 and 1.9.

Finally, it has also long been held that generic Top-Level Domains (in this case: ".com") are generally disregarded when evaluating the confusing similarity between a disputed domain name and a trademark. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, 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.

While 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 often impossible 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

Having reviewed the 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, since it has never assigned, granted, licensed, sold, transferred or in any way authorized the Respondent to register or use the ADBLUE trademark in any manner. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's contentions. The Panel notes that the Respondent's name listed in the registration details of the disputed domain name is "Adblu Technology". While this name would appear to correspond to the composition of the disputed domain name, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name for the purposes of the policy. Rather, as discussed further below, it appears this choice in name was intended to play on or falsely suggest affiliation with the Complainant noting in particular the Complainant's reputation in the same industry and the Respondent's use of the Complainant's mark ADBLUE (including the final "e") on the website resolving from the disputed domain name.

Further, the composition of the disputed domain name (misspelling of the Complainant's mark ADBLUE), coupled with the descriptive term "tech" and the use of the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that purported to provide the Complainant's goods and/or falsely claimed that the website is affiliated with the Complainant, affirms the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website at the disputed domain name.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

As stated in many decisions rendered under the Policy both conditions, registration and use in bad faith, must be demonstrated; consequently, the Complainant must show that:

- the disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent in bad faith, and

- the disputed domain name is being used by the Respondent in bad faith.

In the present case, the Complainant provided evidence which demonstrates that it owns and/or has rights in the distinctive and well-known registered trademark ADBLUE, registered and used in many jurisdictions around the world before the disputed domain name was registered.

It is therefore inconceivable for this Panel that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its rights in the mark ADBLUE, which leads to the necessary inference of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.2.

This finding is supported by the fact that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark ADBLUE entirely and only omits the letter "e" in the word "blue" which is a common, obvious and intentional misspelling of the Complainant's trademark and adds the descriptive suffix "tech".

Therefore, the Panel is convinced that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith by the Respondent.

The Complainant has also put forward evidence that the disputed domain name was used by the Respondent to resolve to a website featuring the Complainant's ADBLUE mark and pretends to be offering ADBLUE goods of the Complainant. In doing so, the Respondent gives Internet users the impression that the site is controlled or at least authorized by the Complainant, which is not the case. This clearly disrupts the Complainant's business and shows that the Respondent intentionally attempts to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark, which constitutes bad faith use.

The evidence and documents produced and put forward by the Complainant together with the fact that the Respondent has failed to present any evidence of any good faith registration and use with regard to the disputed domain name further prove that the disputed domain name was registered and is used by the Respondent in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Based on the available record, 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 <adblutech.com> be cancelled.

/Peter Burgstaller/
Peter Burgstaller
Sole Panelist
Date: June 22, 2026