

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Alfa Laval Corporate AB v. Gina Yu
Case No. D2026-1510

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Gina Yu, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <alfalaval.online> 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 April 9, 2026. On April 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 11, 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 / Withheld for Privacy Purposes/Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 13, 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 14, 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 17, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 7, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Reyes Campello Estebaranz as the sole panelist in this matter on May 13, 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 Swedish corporation and a global leader in heat transfer, separation, and fluid handling technologies, serving diverse industries including marine, energy, pharma, and food sectors. Established in 1883 as “AB Separator” and renamed “Alfa-Laval AB” in 1963, the Complainant has operated under the ALFA LAVAL name and trademark for over a century.

The Complainant holds numerous trademark registrations for its ALFA LAVAL brand in over 200 jurisdictions worldwide, including:

- Swedish Trademark Registration No. 1900-06089, ALFA LAVAL (figurative), registered on December 13, 1897;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 764251, ALFA LAVAL (word), registered on February 4, 1964;
- International Trademark Registration No. 1141965, ALFA LAVAL (figurative), registered on April 26, 2012;
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 018170847, ALFA LAVAL (figurative), registered on June 24, 2020; and
- Chinese Trademark Registration No. 1708449, ALFA LAVAL (figurative), registered on February 7, 2002;

Hereinafter collectively referred to as the “ALFA LAVAL Mark.”

The Complainant maintains a significant online presence through various domain names incorporating the ALFA LAVAL Mark, most notably its primary website at the domain name <alfalaval.com>, as well as several country-code Top-Level Domains (“ccTLDs”) such as <alfalaval.us>, <alfalaval.co.uk>, and <alfalaval.cn>.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 30, 2026. As per the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolves to a Registrar’s parking page featuring an offer for sale for USD 1,450. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name still resolves to the Registrar’s parking page where it is offered for sale for USD 1,450 or via a “lease-to-own” arrangement for USD 242 per month.

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 asserts that the ALFA LAVAL Mark has been consistently recognized as well known in numerous prior UDRP decisions (e.g., *Alfa Laval Corporate AB v. Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0148561631 / Erin Dickey, EDickey Ltd*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-1617](#); *Alfa Laval Corporate AB v. YangZhiChao*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-2316](#); and *Alfa Laval Corporate AB v. Jim Wilson*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-2371](#)). The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s reputed trademark, as it incorporates the ALFA LAVAL Mark in its entirety. Furthermore, the Complainant submits that the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) suffix “.online” should be disregarded for the purposes of assessing confusing

similarity. The global reputation of the mark is further evidenced by a 2014 Swedish market survey, and a Chinese judicial decision.¹

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. There is no relationship or affiliation between the Parties; the Respondent is not authorized to use the ALFA LAVAL Mark and holds no relevant trademark registrations or applications for the terms included in the disputed domain name. Furthermore, there is no evidence of a bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, the disputed domain name resolves to a Registrar's "broker page" for the sole purpose of resale. The Respondent's use of a privacy service to hide its identity further indicates a lack of intent to use the disputed domain name for any legitimate commercial or noncommercial purpose. Additionally, the global notoriety of the ALFA LAVAL Mark precludes any plausible legitimate interest, as any use by an unaffiliated third party would inevitably infringe upon the Complainant's exclusive rights.

Finally, the Complainant maintains that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The offer to sell the disputed domain name for a fairly large price (USD 1,450) supports bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy. Given the distinctiveness and fame of the ALFA LAVAL Mark, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration; the selection of an identical mark by an unaffiliated entity creates a presumption of bad faith, as there is no plausible good faith use for such a registration by an unaffiliated third party. Furthermore, the Complainant points to the Respondent's history of infringing behavior, specifically citing *CLARINS v. Gina Yu*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-0060](#), as evidence of a pattern of conduct intended to prevent trademark owners from reflecting their marks in corresponding domain names (paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy). The lack of an active website, other than a commercial offer for sale, confirms the Respondent's intent to trade on the Complainant's reputation.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

The Complainant has submitted all relevant assertions under the Policy, and the dispute properly falls within its scope. The Panel has the authority to decide the dispute by examining the three elements set forth in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, taking into account all relevant evidence, annexed materials, and submissions. The Panel may also conduct limited independent research pursuant to its general powers, as provided, *inter alia*, in paragraph 10 of the Rules.

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, namely the ALFA LAVAL Mark. The trademark registrations provided by the Complainant satisfy the threshold requirement of having trademark rights. Under the first element of the UDRP, the specific location of the trademark registration, the date of registration, and the goods and/or services for which the mark is protected are generally considered irrelevant to the standing requirement. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1; and, e.g., *Tinynova LLC v. Chris Edwards, Orion Interactive*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-0804](#).

¹Civil Judgement of Intermediate People's Court of Nanjing City of Jiangsu Province of People's Republic of China, (2011) Civil Case Filing No. 443, partially translated as Annex 24 of the Complaint.

The entirety of the ALFA LAVAL Mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the mark is recognizable, and the disputed domain name is considered identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Furthermore, the addition of the gTLD “.online” is viewed as a standard registration requirement and is disregarded under the first element test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.

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. However, 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 notes that the combination of terms “alfa” and “laval” is not a common phrase in any sector or industry, except when referencing the Complainant and its notorious trademark within its field of activity.

The word “alfa” (the first letter of the Greek alphabet) commonly represents the beginning, a primary position, or a specific variable in fields such as physics and geometry. However, the term “laval” has no dictionary meaning, being derived from the name of one of the Complainant’s founders. There is nothing in the record to suggest any connection between the Respondent and these terms.

The Panel observes that the Respondent’s name bears no similarity to the disputed domain name and finds no evidence indicating that the Respondent is commonly known by said name. In this regard, the Panel has confirmed through a search over the Global Brand Database that the Respondent holds no trademark rights for the terms included in the disputed domain name.²

The Panel further finds that the nature and composition of the disputed domain name - being identical to the mark - falsely suggests an affiliation with the Complainant. UDRP panels have consistently held that domain names identical to a complainant’s trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation, which precludes any claim to rights or legitimate interests by an unauthorized third party. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Furthermore, the overall facts and circumstances of this case do not support a finding of fair use. On the contrary, the disputed domain name is offered for sale for a price likely exceeding its registration costs. Given the lack of any generic quality of the fanciful term “laval” included in the disputed domain name, and its

²Under the general powers articulated in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, a panel may undertake limited factual research into public records if such information is useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8.

direct association with the Complainant when combined with the term “alfa”, this offer indicates an intent to capitalize on the reputation and value of the ALFA LAVAL Mark.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that 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 Panel concurs with previous UDRP panels that have recognized the ALFA LAVAL Mark as being extensively used and highly reputed worldwide (e.g., *Alfa Laval Corporate AB v. Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0148561631 / Erin Dickey, EDickey Ltd.*, supra; *Alfa Laval Corporate AB v. YangZhiChao*, supra; and *Alfa Laval Corporate AB v. Jim Wilson*, supra).

The Panel further notes the Chinese judicial decision cited by the Complainant, which acknowledges the reputation of the ALFA LAVAL Mark specifically in China - the jurisdiction where the Respondent is reportedly located according to the Whois information provided by the Registrar.³

Additionally, given the mark's century-long history and its pervasive online presence, the Panel corroborated that any search for the term “alfalaval” (or “alfa laval”) consistently reveals the Complainant and its trademark.

These factors, combined with the identity between the disputed domain name and the mark, clearly point to a targeting in bad faith of the reputed trademark with the registration and use of the dispute domain name. Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical to a well-known trademark, and particularly in the case of coined or fanciful marks, can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4. In view of the Complainant's international notoriety, the Panel finds it inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the ALFA LAVAL Mark at the time of registration. This finding, coupled with the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests and the failure to rebut the Complainant's allegations, supports a finding of bad faith registration.

In this context, the Respondent's attempt to derive unfair commercial gain by offering the disputed domain name for sale for a price (USD 1,450) likely exceeding out-of-pocket costs constitutes evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

Furthermore, the Panel finds that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of conduct designed to prevent trademark owners from reflecting their marks in corresponding domain names, pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy. The Respondent has been involved in at least one other prior UDRP proceeding (*CLARINS v. Gina Yu*, supra) involving substantially similar circumstances. UDRP panels have consistently held that a pattern of bad faith conduct can be established with as few as two cases of abusive registration, and that such a pattern of abuse can be found where the respondent registers, simultaneously or otherwise, multiple trademark-abusive domain names corresponding to the same brand or to distinct marks of individual brand owners. [WIPO Overview 3.1.2](#); and, e.g., *Autodesk, Inc. v. Bayram Fatih Aksoy*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-2000](#).

Additionally, given the strict identity between the disputed domain name and the well-known ALFA LAVAL Mark, the Panel finds that it is inconceivable for the Respondent to make any good faith use of the disputed domain name without causing consumer confusion and/or infringing upon the Complainant's rights.

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

³See supra footnote 1.

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 <alfalaval.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Reyes Campello Estebaranz/

Reyes Campello Estebaranz

Sole Panelist

Date: May 19, 2026