

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Archer-Daniels-Midland Company v. Serafina Palacz, Zajaczkowski,
Adamczyk and Kubik
Case No. D2026-1106

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Archer-Daniels-Midland Company, United States of America (“US”), represented by Innis Law Group LLC, US.

The Respondent is Serafina Palacz, Zajaczkowski, Adamczyk and Kubik, Poland.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <adm-book.com> is registered with Hello Internet Corp (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 13, 2026. On March 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 17, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 17, 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 amendment to the Complaint on March 17, 2026.

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 March 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Rebecca Slater as the sole panelist in this matter on April 16, 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 US corporation, which is widely known by its initials “ADM”. The Complainant is an agribusiness, with business areas including food and ingredients, printing and publishing, financial and business management services, fuel production, logistics services and research and development services. Founded in 1902, the Complainant serves customers in 200 countries, owns more than 800 facilities worldwide, employs over 38,000 people, and reported worldwide net sales of USD 93 billion in 2023.

The Complainant holds various US trade mark registrations for ADM word mark, including US Registration No. 1,386,430 (registered March 18, 1986), US Registration No. 2,301,968 (registered December 21, 1999) and US Registration No. 2,766,613 (registered September 23, 2003) (the “Trade Mark”). It also holds trade mark registrations for the ADM word mark in many other jurisdictions, including the European Union, Poland and China.

The Complainant also uses the Trade Mark in connection with its business and website at “www.adm.com”.

The Respondent is an individual, apparently located in Poland. The Respondent did not submit a response, and, consequently, little information is known about the Respondent.

The disputed domain name was registered March 4, 2026. The disputed domain name is currently inactive. The disputed domain name previously resolved to landing page where webpage visitors were requested to verify their legitimacy as a human, by pressing certain keys on the keyboard. The Complainant submits that upon clicking the verification button, visitors’ information would be stolen and malware downloaded onto their device (known as a “ClickFix” malware captcha scam).

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 confusingly similar to the Trade Mark because the disputed domain name reproduces the Trade Mark in its entirety. The additional term “-book” is generic and does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Further, the additional term may increase confusion by suggesting a website for booking meetings or other interactions with the Complainant.
- The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has not used the disputed domain name in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services or any legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The disputed domain name previously resolved to a webpage that facilitated a “ClickFix” malware captcha scam.
- The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Given the fame and international reputation of the Trade Mark, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and intentionally registered the disputed domain name to exploit the Trade Mark and mislead Internet users into believing that they had reached a legitimate website of the Complainant. The impersonation of the Complainant and use of the disputed domain name in connection with a malware scheme amount to clear evidence of bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, namely:

- the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The onus of proving these elements is on the Complainant.

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 or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Trade Mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "-book") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of this term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 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 Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the Trade Mark and there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Additionally, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name has been used for a "ClickFix" malware captcha scam. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, potentially impersonation of the Complainant or deployment of malware) 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.

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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds it unlikely that the disputed domain name was registered without knowledge of the Complainant and the Trade Mark, given the worldwide reputation of both the Complainant and the Trade Mark. The Respondent's goal in registering and using the disputed domain name appears to be to attract Internet users by taking unfair advantage of and creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's well-known Trade Mark. This amounts to "opportunistic bad faith" in violation of the Policy.

Additionally, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, potentially fraudulent impersonation of the Complainant or deployment of malware) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 <adm-book.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Rebecca Slater/

Rebecca Slater

Sole Panelist

Date: April 22, 2026