

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

REMA 1000 Danmark A/S v. Rema Distribution
Case No. D2026-1691

1. The Parties

The Complainant is REMA 1000 Danmark A/S, Denmark, represented internally.

The Respondent is Rema Distribution, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <remadistribution.com> is registered with Nicenic International Group Co., Limited (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 21, 2026. On April 22, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 23, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 24, 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 April 27, 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 April 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 17, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Luca Barbero as the sole panelist in this matter on May 22, 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 the owner of the Danish company REMA Distribution Danmark A/S, which specializes in the distribution of goods to retail stores.

The Complainant is the owner of the domain name <remadistribution.dk>, which was registered on May 11, 2021, and is used to promote the services provided by REMA Distribution Danmark A/S.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 29, 2025, and is pointed to a website impersonating the Complainant's subsidiary REMA Distribution Danmark A/S, publishing the related company name and registered address and promoting the services offered by the company, indicating however an email address based on the disputed domain name. The website expressly mentions that "The REMA Distribution is a Denmark-based company specializing in the export of fast-moving consumer goods (FMCG)" and the services offered are described as follows: "We deliver in-demand products such as snacks, confectionery, beverages, household essentials, personal care, and baby items. With trusted suppliers and efficient logistics, we provide competitive solutions and reliable service to international markets".

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, while it does not hold a registered trademark for REMA DISTRIBUTION, it has obtained unregistered (common law) trademark rights in such mark through long-standing and extensive use in commerce.

The Complainant states that it has used the mark REMA DISTRIBUTION, since at least August 30, 1987, as a distinctive sign to identify and promote its business of distribution of goods to retail stores. The Complainant also states that, over this period of nearly four decades, the company name REMA Distribution Danmark A/S has been used consistently in the Complainant's commercial activities and has come to designate the Complainant's services in the eyes of customers and business partners.

The Complainant points out that the REMA DISTRIBUTION mark appears prominently on the Complainant's business documents and communications, including invoices, contracts and other commercial correspondence, as well as on the Complainant's website and marketing materials. The Complainant concludes that, therefore, through such continuous and substantial use, the sign REMA DISTRIBUTION has become distinctive of the Complainant's business and functions as an unregistered trademark in relation to distribution services.

To substantiate its claim of unregistered trademark rights in REMA DISTRIBUTION, the Complainant submits: i) copy of the business registration certificate of the company REMA Distribution Danmark A/S; ii) an Annual Report of the activities of REMA Distribution Danmark A/S for 2024 showing references to the company name REMA Distribution Danmark A/S, also abbreviated as "REMA Distribution Danmark"; iii) a document showing the Complainant's organization hierarchy, highlighting that REMA Distribution Danmark A/S is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Complainant, which also owns other companies including "REMA" in their company names; iv) an inspection report of the Danish Veterinary, Food, Agriculture and Fisheries Agency with regard to REMA Distribution Danmark A/S; and v) a list of online media pages published

between December 2019 and March 2026 containing references to the Complainant's subsidiary, identified in at least eleven pages as "REMA Distribution".

The Complainant submits that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to impersonate its business and contact customers with the purpose of fraud.

The Complainant states that the Respondent has used the Complainant's logo REMA 1000 and its visual identity on the website corresponding to the disputed domain name and contends that such use creates an obvious and deliberate visual association with the Complainant and its business. The Complainant also states that such use is likely to mislead Internet users into believing that the website is authorized, operated, sponsored by, or otherwise affiliated with the Complainant.

The Complainant concludes that the Respondent is knowingly impersonating its business, with the intent of defrauding the Complainant's customers.

The Complainant also informs the Panel that it received calls from customers who reported that they had confused the website for its own website "www.remadistribution.dk". The Complainant further indicates that the website at the disputed domain name has already been taken down twice by the previous registrar, whereafter it was moved to the current Registrar and reactivated.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules: "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable." Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) that the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent 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.

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 Panel finds the Complainant has established unregistered service mark rights for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3. Indeed, the Panel finds that, based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant referenced in section 5.A above, the Complainant has shown that REMA DISTRIBUTION has become a distinctive identifier which consumers associate with the services of the Complainant's wholly owned subsidiary REMA Distribution Danmark A/S.

Moreover, as stated in section 1.4.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), a parent company filing a UDRP case on the basis of rights held in the name of a company under its corporate umbrella is considered to have rights in a trademark under the Policy for purposes of standing to file a complaint.

The entirety of the REMA DISTRIBUTION mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

In addition, the generic Top-Level Domain “.com” can be disregarded under the first element test, being a standard registration requirement. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Therefore, 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 Panel notes that there is no relation, disclosed to the Panel or otherwise apparent from the record, between the Respondent and the Complainant. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor has the Respondent otherwise obtained an authorization to use the Complainant’s trademark.

Moreover, there is no element from which the Panel could infer the Respondent’s rights over the disputed domain name, or that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain name. Indeed, for a respondent to demonstrate that it has been commonly known by the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name, it must be genuinely “commonly known” by the relevant moniker (e.g., with its personal name, nickname, or corporate identifier), apart from the domain name. [WIPO Overview 2.3](#). In the case at hand, notwithstanding the indication of “Rema Distribution” as registrant name in the Whois records, there is no evidence showing that the Respondent may actually be known by such a name.

As highlighted above, the disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying the Complainant’s figurative mark REMA 1000, indicating as website operator the Complainant’s subsidiary REMA Distribution Danmark A/S, and promoting the related services. The Panel finds that such use of the disputed domain name is apt to cause confusion amongst Internet users as to the source or affiliation of the Respondent’s website with the Complainant and, therefore, does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial use without intent to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the REMA DISTRIBUTION mark.

The Panel also finds that the indication of “Rema Distribution” as registrant name in the Whois records of the disputed domain name and the content of the corresponding website described above suggest that the Respondent intended to impersonate the Complainant and its subsidiary. As stated in section 2.13.1 of the

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, including passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.

Therefore, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has also 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.

In the present case, the Panel finds that, in view of the prior use of the REMA DISTRIBUTION mark by the Complainant's subsidiary REMA Distribution Danmark A/S, and considering the promotion of the services offered by the Complainant's subsidiary via the website at "www.remadistribution.dk", the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant and its REMA DISTRIBUTION mark at the time of registration.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

The composition of the disputed domain name, identical to the REMA DISTRIBUTION mark, and its redirection to a website displaying the Complainant's figurative mark REMA 1000, explicitly mentioning the Complainant's subsidiary as website operator and promoting services identical to the ones offered under the REMA DISTRIBUTION mark, supports the conclusion that the Respondent was indeed actually aware of, and intended to target, the Complainant, its subsidiary and their trademarks.

The Panel also finds that, in view of the redirection of the disputed domain name to the website described above, using the Complainant's figurative mark and displaying misleading indications apt to suggest that the website is operated by the Complainant's subsidiary REMA Distribution Danmark A/S, the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the REMA DISTRIBUTION mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website according to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel also notes that the indication of an email address based on the disputed domain name on the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, and the presence of MX records in the configuration of the disputed domain name suggest that the disputed domain name may have also been used for email communication purposes. The Panel finds that users receiving email communications from an email address based on the disputed domain name may be confused or misled into believing to be communicating with the Complainant or its subsidiary REMA Distribution Danmark A/S, especially in case they also verify the content of the website to which the disputed domain name currently redirects. The Panel also finds that, under the circumstances, the Respondent was aware of, and intentionally created, such likelihood of confusion, and concludes that the configuration and potential use of the disputed domain name for email communication purposes further demonstrates the Respondent's bad faith.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy as well.

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 <remadistribution.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Luca Barbero/

Luca Barbero

Sole Panelist

Date: June 5, 2026