

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Alfa Laval Corporate AB v. Edith Bengel

Case No. D2026-0950

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Alfa Laval Corporate AB, Sweden, represented by Advokatbyrån Gulliksson AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Edith Bengel, United States of America (“U.S.”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <alfalaival.com> is registered with Wild West Domains, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 5, 2026. On March 6, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 6, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 9, 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 March 12, 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 March 17, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 6, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Francine Tan as the sole panelist in this matter on April 15, 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, Alfa Laval Corporate AB, is a company incorporated in Sweden. It is a leading provider of goods and services in the key technology areas of heat transfer, separation and gas and fluid handling across many industries, including the marine, environment, pharma, hygiene, food and energy sectors.

The Complainant's business was established in 1883 under the company name AB Separator, which was changed to Alfa-Laval AB in 1963. The Complainant filed its first trade mark application for the mark ALFA LAVAL in 1897. The Complainant states that as the trade mark has been used for more than 100 years, it is one of the most famous and well-known marks in the aforementioned business sectors.

The Complainant owns numerous trade mark registrations for the mark ALFA LAVAL, including:

- Swedish Trademark Registration No. 6089, registered December 13, 1897;
- European Union Trade Mark No. 018170847, registered June 24, 2020; and
- U.S. Trade Mark No. 0764251, registered February 4, 1964.

The Complainant operates the domain name <alfalaval.com> (registered on May 12, 1997) and other domain names incorporating its ALFA LAVAL trade mark.

The disputed domain name <alfalaival.com> was registered on February 22, 2026. The record indicates that the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website and the Complainant has submitted evidence showing the disputed domain name was used for a business email compromise (BEC) attack against the Complainant's customers.

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 the ALFA LAVAL trade mark. The disputed domain name incorporates all the letters of the Complainant's trade mark, with the addition of the letter "i". The addition of the letter "i" is negligible and does not differentiate the disputed domain name from the Complainant's well-known trade mark.
- (ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. There is no evidence of any bona fide use or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a legitimate offering of goods or services. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has no commercial or other relationship with the Complainant. The Respondent has taken deliberate steps to conceal its identity. The disputed domain name has been used to defraud the Complainant's customers. The Respondent has through a BEC (business email compromise) attack infiltrated one of the Complainant's email correspondence with one of the Complainant's customers. The Respondent sent a fraudulent email. In the fraudulent email, the Respondent used the disputed domain name, making it appear as if the sender of the email is an employee of the Complainant. It claimed that the Complainant had updated its bank account details and requested the customer to provide "beneficiary information".

- (iii) The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent deliberately registered a domain name that is virtually identical to the Complainant's well-known trade mark in order to impersonate the Complainant's communications with its customers for phishing purposes.

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark ALFA LAVAL is recognizable within the disputed domain name <alfalaival.com>. The disputed domain name incorporates all of the letters of the Complainant's ALFA LAVAL mark, with only the insertion of a single letter "i". This is a minor and barely perceptible typographical variation of the kind described as typosquatting in [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

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 that 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 3.1](#), 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.

The Panel accepts the Complainant's evidence that the disputed domain name was used in a BEC phishing attack, whereby the Respondent impersonated as the Complainant's employee to the Complainant's customer. Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, including phishing and identity theft, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 22, 2026, more than a century after the Complainant first used and registered the ALFA LAVAL mark, which is widely recognized across numerous industries and jurisdictions. The Panel finds it inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the ALFA LAVAL mark at the time of registration. In the circumstances of this case, given the worldwide prominence and longevity of the ALFA LAVAL mark, the Panel is satisfied that the Respondent knew of the Complainant's ALFA LAVAL trade mark and registered the disputed domain name specifically to exploit it for illegitimate purposes. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

The evidence produced by the Complainant shows that the Respondent used the disputed domain name as part of a BEC phishing scheme. Such conduct by the Respondent falls squarely within [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4, which notes that panels have held that the use of a domain name for purposes other than hosting a website may constitute bad faith, including sending deceptive emails to solicit fraudulent payments from a complainant's customers.

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 <alfalaival.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Francine Tan/

Francine Tan

Sole Panelist

Date: April 29, 2026