

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

VDA Verband der Automobilindustrie e.V. v. Nawaf Hariri, Salla Application Company
Case No. D2026-1420

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 Nawaf Hariri, Salla Application Company, Saudi Arabia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 2, 2026. On April 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 8, 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 April 15, 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 April 15, 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 April 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 6, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Adam Taylor as the sole panelist in this matter on May 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 is an interest group and lobbying organisation for the German automotive industry.

The Complainant owns many registered trade marks for ADBLUE including International Registration No. 811899, registered on August 8, 2003, in class 1.

The Complainant has established a licensing system for companies worldwide that supply or manufacture urea (used to reduce nitrous oxide emissions in diesel engines) under the ADBLUE mark.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 2, 2023.

When reviewed by the Panel, the disputed domain name resolved to a website in Arabic offering AdBlue products for sale. The header consisted of a blank white space apart from small unlabelled shopping cart/contact buttons on the left and a small stylised “S” logo on the far right.

Beneath that, there were two carousel images:

- A part for an engine with various labels including “AdBlue injection”. The following text was superimposed: “Your smart solution for a cleaner engine and stronger performance! With AdBlue, say goodbye to harmful NOx emissions and enjoy high efficiency for diesel engines – whether in cars or trucks”;
- Close-ups of “AdBlue” (with registered trade mark symbol) and “Diesel” container caps. Text: “Protect your environment, and improve your engine's performance! With AdBlue, reduce emissions and achieve optimal performance for heavy and light diesel engines.”

The website went on to display photos of products for sale, which all included the ADBLUE mark as well as a logo consisting of the word SAAK in English (and what the Panel assumes is the same word in Arabic) plus the same stylised “S” logo mentioned above (“the SAAK Logo”). There was also a slogan: “SAUDI MADE”.

The footer stated: “SAAK. The first Saudi factory producing AdBlue certified ISO22241, producing AdBlue using the latest technologies and the highest quality standards.” There were also contact details including a contact email address at [...]@saak.com.sa.

The Panel notes that there is a website at “www.saak.com.sa” that promotes a construction chemicals factory and is branded with the SAAK Logo.

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 Complainant has no relationship with the Respondent, which has not been authorised by the Complainant to use the ADBLUE trademark;
- there is no reason that could justify the use of Complainant’s ADBLUE trade mark in the disputed domain name in order to offer these goods;

- by using the Complainant's trade mark in the disputed domain name and linked website, the Respondent intentionally attempted to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark; and
- while the goods currently offered by the Respondent are "original "AdBlue" products manufactured by a licensee", such use "within the distribution channel" does not legitimise the use of "AdBlue" as a domain name.

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 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.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "saak") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the 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 recognised 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.

As to paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, the Complainant acknowledges that the goods being sold by the Respondent are “original ‘AdBlue’ products manufactured by a licensee”, implicitly a third party. The Complainant claims to have no relationship with the Respondent, which is apparently a manufacturer of construction-related chemicals, but does not appear on the Complainant’s licensee list¹. However, the Respondent’s website claims that it is the “first Saudi factory producing AdBlue”. Furthermore, the products shown on the Respondent’s site bear the Respondent’s SAAK logo, but the Complainant has not included the product images in its screenshot or commented on the point.

In the circumstances, including lack of any explanation from the Respondent, the Panel will proceed on the basis that there was no prior agreement between the parties, but that the Respondent is nonetheless legitimately selling/reselling AdBlue products. The consensus view of panels is that to establish a bona fide offering of goods or services in such circumstances, a respondent must comply with certain conditions (the “Oki Data requirements”). The domain name itself is viewed as part of the assessment of whether the use of the mark is fair and merely referential. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8.

The Oki Data requirements include the accurate and prominent disclosure of the respondent’s relationship with the trade mark holder. Some panels have adopted a “holistic” approach whereby, even if there is no prominent disclaimer, other factors may clarify affiliation with the complainant, such as domain name composition, website content or other circumstances relating to the use of the domain name and/or the respondent’s business. See, e.g., *KT & G Corporation, and Philip Morris Products S.A. v. Ieva Kalnina*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-0555](#).

Cases applying the Oki Data requirements usually involve a domain name comprising a trade mark plus a descriptive term (e.g., “parts”, “repairs”, or “location”). However, in this case, the disputed domain name comprises the trade mark plus the Respondent’s SAAK mark, which was a good start by the Respondent insofar as it sought to disclaim an official connection with the Complainant.

However, the Respondent did not follow through on its website, where the header is curiously bare. Not only is there no prominent disclaimer, but there is no alternative branding or business identity clearly indicating that the site is operated by an independent reseller. The Respondent appears to have deliberately downplayed its SAAK mark, which does not feature in the header; indeed the “SAAK” portion of the logo has been removed, leaving just the subtle “S” device. Users would have to scroll down to the footer to find the Respondent’s description of its business in conjunction with the “SAAK” mark.

In the Panel’s view, in the absence of any prominent independent reseller positioning, the main introductory images and text mentioned in section 4 above create the impression that this is some sort of official AdBlue website. And, without any explanation from the Respondent, the Panel can only conclude that was the Respondent’s purpose.

Accordingly, notwithstanding the inclusion of the distinctive term “saak” in the disputed domain name, having assessed all of the factors, including the Respondent’s website, the Panel does not consider that the Respondent has taken sufficient steps to deny affiliation with the Complainant; on the contrary, the Respondent’s website has sought to imply a connection with the Complainant’s mark.

For these reasons, the Panel does not consider that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in a bona fide manner.

Nor is there any evidence that paragraphs 4(c)(ii) or (iii) of the Policy are relevant in the circumstances of this case.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

¹ There is one Saudi company on the list, “apsco-The Arabian Petroleum Supply Co.”, which is located in Jeddah, where the Respondent also appears to be based, according to the Respondent’s website at “[www.saak.com.sa](#)”. However, there is no obvious connection between these two companies.

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, for reasons discussed in detail under the second element above, the Panel considers that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trade mark in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) 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 <saakadblue.com> be cancelled.

/Adam Taylor/

Adam Taylor

Sole Panelist

Date: June 4, 2026