

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson v. ericsson NA, ericsson
Case No. D2026-1529

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson, Sweden, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is ericsson NA, ericsson, United States of America (“United States”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ericsson-na.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 10, 2026. On April 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 14, 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 (“Registrant Information Not Disclosed”) 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 20, 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 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 11, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. The panel appointment process commenced on June 5, 2026. The proceedings were suspended on May 12, 2026 until June 13, 2026, at the Complainant’s request and were later reinstated on June 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Alvaro Loureiro Oliveira as the sole panelist in this matter on June 11, 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 company founded in 1876 and one of the world's leading providers of telecommunications equipment, software, infrastructure, and related services. The Complainant operates globally and owns numerous trademark registrations for the mark ERICSSON in several jurisdictions.

Among the trademark registrations relied upon by the Complainant in these proceedings are:

- European Union Trademark No. 000107003 for ERICSSON, registered on March 23, 1999;
- European Union Trademark No. 001459130 for ERICSSON, registered on February 15, 2001; and
- United States Trademark Registration No. 1313196 for ERICSSON, registered on January 8, 1985.

The evidence further shows that the Complainant owns International Registration No. 1024858 (figurative) for ERICSSON, registered on October 7, 2009.

The Complainant has used the ERICSSON trademark for many decades in connection with telecommunications products and services and has established a significant international reputation. The Complaint indicates that the Complainant employs more than 88,000 employees worldwide and reported net sales of SEK 236.7 billion during 2025.

The Complainant also owns and operates the domain name <ericsson.com>, registered in 1989, through which it promotes its products and services worldwide. According to the evidence submitted, the Complainant maintains a substantial online presence through its website and social media channels.

The disputed domain name <ericsson-na.com> was registered on August 6, 2025. The evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that the disputed domain name redirects Internet users to the Complainant's official website. The record further indicates that Mail Exchange ("MX") records were configured for the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has not filed a Response and has not otherwise participated in these proceedings.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it is the owner of longstanding and internationally recognized trademark rights in the mark ERICSSON, evidenced by numerous trademark registrations around the world. The Complainant submits that the mark has been used continuously for many decades and has acquired substantial goodwill and reputation internationally.

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its ERICSSON trademark because it reproduces the trademark in its entirety. According to the Complainant, the addition of the letters "na", separated by a hyphen, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant states that it has never authorized the Respondent to use the ERICSSON trademark and that there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name is not being used in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, the disputed domain name redirects Internet users to the Complainant's own website, which demonstrates targeting of the Complainant and its trademark rather than any legitimate activity on the part of the Respondent.

The Complainant also submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In support of this contention, the Complainant points to the worldwide reputation of the ERICSSON trademark, the incorporation of that trademark in its entirety within the disputed domain name, the redirection to the Complainant's official website, and the presence of active MX records associated with the disputed domain name, which may facilitate deceptive email communications.

The Complainant therefore requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to it.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires the Complainant to prove each of the following three elements in order to obtain the requested remedy:

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

The Panel has reviewed the record submitted by the Complainant and, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, may draw such inferences as it considers appropriate from the Respondent's failure to submit a Response. While a respondent's default does not automatically result in a decision in favor of a complainant, the Panel may accept reasonable allegations and supported evidence that are not contradicted by the record.

In reaching its conclusions, the Panel has taken into consideration the consensus views reflected in the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), where appropriate.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has established rights in the trademark ERICSSON through the trademark registrations submitted into the record.

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name incorporates the ERICSSON trademark in its entirety. The trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The addition of the letters "na", separated by a hyphen, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. As reflected in section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of descriptive, geographical, or other terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Likewise, the generic Top-Level Domain (".com") is generally disregarded for purposes of the comparison under the first element.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

The first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel finds that the Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The record contains no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or by the name "Ericsson". Nor is there any indication that the Complainant authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the ERICSSON trademark in any manner. In this regard, the Panel notes that the registrant organization identified in the registration details of the disputed domain name is "ericsson", however, there, as noted, there is no evidence before the Panel that the Respondent is actually commonly known by "ericsson". Rather, it appears most likely that such details were specifically chosen to falsely suggest an affiliation with the Complainant, which is further affirmed by redirection of the disputed domain name to the Complainant's official site.

The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's well-known trademark together with the non-distinctive term "na". In the circumstances of this case, such composition carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant and does not support any claim to rights or legitimate interests.

The evidence further demonstrates that the disputed domain name redirects Internet users to the Complainant's official website. Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, nor does it amount to a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. On the contrary, such conduct reinforces the conclusion that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name because of its association with the Complainant and its trademark.

The Respondent has chosen not to participate in these proceedings and has therefore failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The second element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that the ERICSSON trademark is highly distinctive and enjoys a substantial international reputation acquired through many decades of use in connection with telecommunications products and services. The trademark registrations relied upon by the Complainant significantly predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's trademark in its entirety and merely adds the suffix "-na". In the Panel's view, there is no plausible explanation for the Respondent's selection of the disputed domain name other than an intention to target the Complainant and its trademark rights.

Particularly relevant is the evidence showing that the disputed domain name redirects Internet users to the Complainant's official website. Such conduct demonstrates actual knowledge of the Complainant and confirms that the Respondent intentionally sought to exploit the goodwill associated with the Complainant and its business. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

The Panel further notes the presence of MX records associated with the disputed domain name. Although the record does not establish that the disputed domain name has actually been used for fraudulent email communications, the configuration of email functionality in connection with a domain name incorporating a well-known trademark, and especially where the domain name redirects to the Complainant's own website, increases the risk of phishing, impersonation, or other deceptive conduct and may properly be taken into account in the assessment of bad faith.

Considering the fame of the ERICSSON trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, the absence of any plausible good-faith explanation for its registration, the redirection of the disputed domain name to the Complainant's own website, the provision of false information in the registration details of the disputed domain name, and the presence of active MX records, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

The third element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

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 <ericsson-na.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Alvaro Loureiro Oliveira/

Alvaro Loureiro Oliveira

Sole Panelist

Date: June 19, 2026