

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Tetra Laval Holdings & Finance S.A. v. Hannah Brooks, HeliFlite
Case No. D2026-1175

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Tetra Laval Holdings & Finance S.A., Switzerland, represented by Aera A/S, Denmark.

The Respondent is Hannah Brooks, HeliFlite, United States of America (“US”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <tetraapak.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 19, 2026. On March 19, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 19, 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 (“Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 20, 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 the same day.

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 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 13, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 14, 2026.

The Center appointed Martin Michaus Romero as the sole panelist in this matter on April 21, 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 stated that it:

1.- is a Swiss corporation which is a part of the Tetra Laval Group - The Tetra Laval Group consists of three independent industry groups; Tetra Pak, DeLaval and Sidel Group.

2.-The Tetra Pak Group is:

A) a multinational food processing and packaging company founded in 1947 in Sweden by Ruben Rausing;

B) develops markets and sells equipment for processing, packaging and distribution of food products. Products such as e.g., dairy products, beverages, ice cream, cheese, food, vegetables, and pet food are processed and packaged in the processing and packaging lines of Tetra Pak;

C) is world leading within development, production and sale of equipment and processing plants for making, packaging and distributing food and accessories;

D) employs more than 25000 people and is operative in more than 160 countries worldwide.

3.- Complainant owns the TETRA PAK trademark, which, is registered both as word as well as part of device marks, in more than 160 countries throughout the world with more than 1500 registrations hereunder, including but not limited to:

A) Swedish Trademark Registration No 71196 TETRA PAK, registered in 1951.

B) International Registration No. 1146433 TETRA PAK registered in 2012.

C) US trademark registrations: a) No. 586480 TETRA PAK registered in 1954 and;

b) No. 580219 TETRA PAK registered in 1953.

4.- The Complainant asserts that it is the owner of 300 domain name registrations throughout the world containing the TETRA PAK mark distributed among generic Top-Level Domains.

5.-The fame of the trademark TETRA PAK has been confirmed in previous UDRP cases, cited in the Complaint.

6.- By virtue of the Complainant's long use and renown of its TETRA PAK mark, TETRA PAK is associated exclusively with the Complainant and its licensee Tetra Pak.

7.- The disputed domain name was registered on February 20, 2026. The Complainant has furnished evidence that it was used for sending emails impersonating the Complainant in furtherance of a fraudulent phishing scheme.

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.

The Complainant contends that:

- 1.- The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the TETRA PAK trademark as the domain name is deliberate misspelling the well-known trademark.
- 2.-The Respondent has no rights to or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name based on the Complainant's continuous and long prior use of its trademark and trade name "TETRA PAK".
- 3.-The Respondent is not using the domain name in connection with any bona fide offering goods or services. It is not generally known by the disputed domain name.
- 4.-It is evident that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its distinctive and unique TETRA PAK trademark and targeted the trademark when registering the disputed domain name,
- 5.-The Respondent is seeking to create an impression of association with the Complainant by registering the disputed domain name including the well-known TETRA PAK trademark. The Respondent is using the domain name to impersonate a Complainant's recruiter in connection with email phishing.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under the Policy, the complainant is required to prove on the balance of probabilities that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The disputed domain name consists of a misspelling of the TETRA PAK trademark by adding an "a", and the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ".com" may be disregarded for the purposes of the first element test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.9 and 1.11.1.

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 with 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 considers that the misspelling of the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain name signals an intention on the part of the Respondent to confuse users seeking or expecting the Complainant, which is further affirmed by the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name for fraudulent purposes. The Respondent has neither used the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services nor for a legitimate noncommercial or fair purpose. On the contrary, the disputed domain name has been used to impersonate a Complainant's recruiter in connection with a fraudulent email scheme. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here claimed as applicable to this case: phishing, passing off, 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 name constitute bad faith under the Policy.

In the present case, the Panel notes that:

- A) The Respondent was aware of the existence of the Complainant and its activities.
- B) The disputed domain name consists of a misspelling of the TETRA PAK trademark.
- C) The Complainant's well-known TETRA PAK trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain name.
- D) The Respondent has used the disputed domain name for a fraudulent email scheme by impersonating a Complainant's recruiter.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here claimed as applicable to this case: phishing, passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Further, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to disrupt the Complainant's business by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship. Such conduct constitutes evidence of registration and use in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iii) of 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 <tetraapak.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Martin Michaus-Romero/
Martin Michaus-Romero
Sole Panelist
Date: May 4, 2026