

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Viestimedia Oy v. ABDUL QADIR, CODEISOLUTION LTD  
Case No. D2026-1818

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Viestimedia Oy, Finland, represented by Legal Folks Oy, Finland.

The Respondent is ABDUL QADIR, CODEISOLUTION LTD, United Kingdom.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <maaseuduntulevaisuus.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 29, 2026. On April 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 30, 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 (“Scandinavian Content Marketing”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 1, 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 May 4, 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 May 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 28, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on May 2, 2026, and filed a Response on May 8, 2026. The Center commenced the panel appointment process on June 2, 2026.

The Center appointed Luca Barbero as the sole panelist in this matter on June 5, 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 Finnish media company and publisher of the newspaper Maaseudun Tulevaisuus, which has been published in Finland since 1916.

The online edition of the Complainant's newspaper is available at "www.maaseuduntulevaisuus.fi", which is operated by the Complainant and is based on the domain name <maaseuduntulevaisuus.fi>, registered on April 6, 1999.

The Complainant claims unregistered trademark rights in MAASEUDUN TULEVAISUUS based on the following arguments:

- the MAASEUDUN TULEVAISUUS newspaper has been published for 110 years;
- the MAASEUDUN TULEVAISUUS newspaper is one of the strongest brands in the Finnish media landscape, being the second largest newspaper in Finland. The print edition has 231,000 committed readers and the Complainant's website reaches 500,000 users weekly;
- through long-standing, continuous, and extensive use of MAASEUDUN TULEVAISUUS as the title and source identifier of the Complainant's newspaper and related online media services, MAASEUDUN TULEVAISUUS has become a distinctive identifier associated by the relevant public with the Complainant;
- according to market research, over 90% Finns recognize MAASEUDUN TULEVAISUUS brand;
- MAASEUDUN TULEVAISUUS is also a registered auxiliary company name of the Complainant.

The following documents have been submitted in attachment to the Complaint to support the Complainant's allegations:

- an excerpt from the first edition of the MAASEUDUN TULEVAISUUS newspaper dated 1916;
- copy of a translated Trade Register extract concerning the Complainant, showing that "Maaseudun Tulevaisuus" is a registered auxiliary company name of the Complainant since January 11, 1999;
- an excerpt from the Finnish National Media Study (Kansallinen Mediatutkimus, KMT), conducted annually by Kantar Media Finland and ordered by Media Metrics Finland, covering over 23,000 residents aged 15 and over, showing that the MAASEUDUN TULEVAISUUS newspaper (in print and digital copy) was the second largest newspaper in Finland with 231,000 readers in 2025 and the total reach of Maaseudun Tulevaisuus was 561,000 in 2025;
- an excerpt from a study conducted in 2024 by using the Kantar GallupKanava respondent database, where the panel consists of approximately 30,000 Finns who represent the Finnish population aged 15-79, showing that according to the 2024 results, 93% of the respondents recognize MAASEUDUN TULEVAISUUS;
- an excerpt from an online survey conducted in 2023 by Taloustutkimus based on spontaneous recognition, showing that, according to the study, 91% of Finns recognize MAASEUDUN TULEVAISUUS.

The disputed domain name <maaseuduntulevaisuus.com> was registered on October 25, 2024, and is pointed to a website in Finnish publishing news and articles related to entertainment, celebrities, sports, lifestyle and films. A logo encompassing the terms "Maaseudun Tulevaisuus" is published on the top left corner of the home page. The copyright line on the website reads "Maaseudun Tulevaisuus @ 2026. All

Rights Reserved". A link "Laki / Vastuuvapauslauseke" at the bottom of the home page leads to an internal page displaying a disclaimer in Finnish that can be translated into English as follows: "This website is an independent blog that comments on the rural economy, agriculture and media coverage in Finland. The website is not affiliated with, endorsed or affiliated with, the Maaseudun Tulevaisuus newspaper or its publisher Viestimedia Oy. All trademarks and product names are the property of their respective owners".

## **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 disputed domain name <maaseuduntulevaisuus.com> is identical to the trademark MAASEUDUN TULEVAISUUS in which the Complainant has unregistered rights as it reproduces the trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com".

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since: i) the Respondent is in no way affiliated, licensed, authorized or otherwise permitted to use the MAASEUDUN TULEVAISUUS mark in any way including for the registration of the disputed domain name; ii) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, also considering the website to which the disputed domain name resolves identifies the operator as "Scandinavian Content Marketing"; iii) the Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services under an independently adopted corresponding name, as it is using a domain name identical to the Complainant's trademark to operate a Finnish-language content or media site under the exact designation "Maaseudun Tulevaisuus", which is apt to mislead users as its source, affiliation, or endorsement.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith since: i) the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in full knowledge of the Complainant as its website disclaimer expressly refers to the MAASEUDUN TULEVAISUUS newspaper and to the Complainant, confirming the Respondent's actual awareness of the mark; ii) the Respondent is using an identical domain name to purportedly operate a website about rural economy, agriculture, and rural Finland, which is precisely the field in which the Complainant's publication is established and known; iii) the Respondent was contacted by the Complainant and requested an amount of 320,000 EUR to transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant, which far exceeded the out-of-pocket costs related to the domain name, also asserting that another buyer had offered EUR 170,000 for the disputed domain name; iv) the Respondent has intentionally attempted to create a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website; and v) the Respondent claimed to plan to operate an "independent blog" but such claim is undermined by the website's outbound links to Finnish online-casino bonus content, which is unrelated to any bona fide informational use of a domain name identical to the Complainant's trademark and instead supports the inference that the disputed domain name is being used as a traffic-diversion or monetization vehicle.

### **B. Respondent**

The Respondent denies the Complainant's allegations and states that the disputed domain name was registered based on the descriptive nature of the Finnish wording "maaseudun" and "tulevaisuus", which translate to "rural" and "future", and was selected to develop an independent informational website covering rural and general media topics.

The Respondent states that the registration of the disputed domain name was not made with the intention of targeting any specific entity, publication, or trademark.

The Respondent also submits that it is not affiliated with the Complainant and has never represented otherwise, that no logos, branding elements, or visual identity associated with the Complainant have been used. The Respondent also states that its website has been presented as an independent platform, and steps have been taken to clarify that it is not connected with any third party.

With reference to the communication exchange with the Complainant, the Respondent states that any discussion of figures was made in the context of development-related costs, including content creation and technical work associated with the project and submits that contrary to the Complainant's allegations, the disputed domain name was not registered for the purpose of being sold, and there was no intention to profit from any third party's trademark or reputation.

The Respondent concludes that it acted in good faith throughout, including engaging in correspondence, offering to clarify independence, and expressing willingness to avoid any potential misunderstanding, actions which are to be seen as inconsistent with any allegation of bad faith registration or use.

## **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 trademark or service mark rights for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3.

Indeed, the Panel has reviewed the documents and statements submitted by the Complainant and finds that they are sufficient to establish unregistered trademark rights on MAASEUDUN TULEVAISUUS for the purpose of standing in this proceeding.

The entirety of the 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.

As to the gTLD ".com", it is a standard registration requirement and can be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [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 rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing but has not come forward with sufficient evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

According to the evidence on record, there is no relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent, and the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its trademark or register domain names containing the 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.

The Respondent claims that it registered the disputed domain name in view of the descriptive nature of the Finnish words “maaseudun” and “tulevaisuus”, which translate to “rural” and “future”, and states that it selected the disputed domain name to develop “an independent informational website covering rural and general media topics”.

The Panel notes that merely registering a domain name comprised of a dictionary word or phrase does not by itself automatically confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. The overall facts and circumstances of the case are relevant, such as the website content, indication of the respondent’s intent to target the complainant, the status and fame of the complainant’s mark and whether the respondent has registered and legitimately used other domain names containing dictionary words or phrases in connection with the respective dictionary meaning. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.10.

The Panel notes that, based on the records, the Respondent does not appear to have used the disputed domain name to host content that corresponds to the dictionary meaning of “Maaseudun Tulevaisuus” prior to receiving notice of the dispute, as it has pointed the disputed domain name to a website publishing news and articles unrelated to agriculture and rural areas or economy, including a link to an online casino - which has subsequently been removed. Moreover, in the “Tietoja meistä” (“About Us”) section of the website, it is stated that the website is used to publish articles on a variety of topics, “including news, politics, economics, entertainment, food, lifestyle, technology, artificial intelligence, sports, and wellness”, but no reference is made to agriculture or rural areas.

Only after being contacted by the Complainant, the Respondent included a disclaimer indicating that its website was an “independent blog that comments on the rural economy, agriculture and media coverage in Finland” and was “not affiliated with, endorsed or affiliated with, the Maaseudun Tulevaisuus newspaper or its publisher Viestimedia Oy”.

On the other hand, the Panel notes that, considering the Respondent's asserted intention to operate a website about rural economy and agriculture in Finland, it could not have been unaware of the Complainant and its MAASEUDUN TULEVAISUUS publication, which is established and known in that specific sector. Indeed, considering the popularity of the Complainant's newspaper MAASEUDUN TULEVAISUUS in Finland, the Respondent's selection of the disputed domain name, identical to the Complainant's trademark MAASEUDUN TULEVAISUUS, does not appear to be coincidental.

Moreover, in view of the identity of the disputed domain name with the Complainant's trademark and its domain name <maaseuduntulevaisuus.fi>, as well as the substantial identity of the services provided on the respective websites, the Panel finds that Internet users visiting the Respondent's website will likely be misled into believing that it is operated by the Complainant.

Based on the record, the Panel therefore concludes that the disputed domain name has not been used for a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial use without intention to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Complainant's trademark.

Lastly, the Panel notes that there is no evidence showing that the Respondent may have engaged in the registration and legitimate use of other domain names containing dictionary words or phrases in connection with the respective dictionary meaning and concludes that, under the circumstances, the Respondent has not shown that it has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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, considering the Complainant's MAASEUDUN TULEVAISUUS newspaper has been published since 1916 and is the second most read newspaper in Finland, being also available online at the Complainant's website "www.maaseuduntulevaisuus.fi", the Respondent, who appears to be familiar with the media sector in Finland, knew or should have known of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

In view of the composition of the disputed domain name, identical to MAASEUDUN TULEVAISUUS, and its redirection to a website in Finnish providing news and articles on various topics unrelated to the dictionary meaning of "maaseudun tulevaisuus" – except in the disclaimer added after the Respondent was contacted by the Complainant – the Panel finds that, on balance of probabilities, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name because of its correspondence with the name of the Complainant's publication.

The Panel also finds that the redirection of the disputed domain name to a website displaying a MAASEUDUN TULEVAISUUS logo and providing news and articles in direct competition with the Complainant's online newspaper at "www.maaseuduntulevaisuus.fi", suggests that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website, according to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Lastly, the Panel finds that, in light of the content of the correspondence exchanged between the Parties before the filing of the Complaint, particularly the request of 320,000 EUR formulated by the Respondent for transferring the disputed domain name to the Complainant, the Respondent also registered the disputed domain name for the purpose of selling it to the Complainant for an amount well in excess of the documented out of pockets costs directly related to the disputed domain name according to paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

In view of the above, 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 <maaseuduntulevaisuus.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Luca Barbero/*

**Luca Barbero**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 18, 2026