

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Alimak Group Management AB v. MDX OMI, Grace Arena
Case No. D2026-1937

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Alimak Group Management AB, Sweden, represented by Abion AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is MDX OMI, Grace Arena, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 5, 2026. On May 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 6, 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 Domains By Proxy, LLC DomainsByProxy.com) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 7, 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 7, 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 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 7, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Uwa Ohiku as the sole panelist in this matter on June 15, 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 global leader in sustainable vertical access and working-at-height solutions, providing industrial elevators, construction hoists, work platforms and height safety systems. It uses its ALIMAK mark in connection with its products and services in over 120 countries where it operates.

The Complainant owns the following trademarks, amongst others:

- International Trademark Registration No. 1622403 registered on December 12, 2019.
- United States of America Trademark Registration No. 1673194 registered on January 28, 1992.
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 018089420 registered on March 7, 2020.

The Complainant also owns the domain names <alimakgroup.com>, registered on March 26, 2015, and <alimak.com> registered on April 3, 1996, both resolving to its official website.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 24, 2026, and the Complainant provides evidence showing that on the same day, the disputed domain name was used in connection with an email address impersonating the Complainant, to send a phishing message to third parties. At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to an inactive page, and this position is unchanged.

The Respondent appears to be an entity with an address in the United States.

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 names. Notably, the Complainant contends amongst several contentions, as follows:

Identical or Confusingly Similar: That the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark ALIMAK in which the Complainant holds earlier registered and established rights; that the addition of the term "gorup" (a deliberate misspelling of the term "group" and regarded as typosquatting), in the disputed domain name, does not eliminate confusing similarity and Internet users would be misled into believing that the disputed domain name is associated with or endorsed by the Complainant, which is not the case; that the applicable Top-Level Domain ("TLD") is disregarded under the first element of confusing similarity. The Complainant further asserts that it has garnered substantial use, reputation and goodwill in the ALIMAK mark, long before the registration of the disputed domain name.

No Rights or Legitimate Interests: That the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the ALIMAK trademark; that the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use a mark that is confusingly similar to the ALIMAK trademark or trade name, in whole or in part, in any manner whatsoever, including as a domain name and that the use of a term confusingly similar to the ALIMAK trademark as a part of the disputed domain name is in bad faith and solely intended to give the impression of an association or relationship with the Complainant. The Complainant additionally contends, with evidence, that the Respondent sent an email using the disputed domain name, impersonating the Complainant with respect to an outstanding debt and that such a fraudulent and deceptive practice poses a serious security risk to the Complainant's clients and sullies the reputation of the Complainant's business under the ALIMAK trademark, which is further evidence of the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Registered and Used in Bad Faith: That Panels have recognized that the registration of disputed domain names incorporating well-known marks by an entity unrelated to the mark is evidence of bad faith and that the Respondent intentionally chose and registered the disputed domain name that is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; that the Respondent has not used or demonstrated preparations to use the disputed domain names in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services, but to disrupt the Complainant's business; that the Respondent deliberately chose the disputed domain names to trade off the reputation and goodwill associated with the Complainant's ALIMAK mark, to cause confusion amongst Internet users and the Complainant's clients and to fraudulently benefit from the confusion; that the Respondent has sent a fraudulent email to the Complainant's customer in an attempt to defraud the customer which reflects bad faith use.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The first element involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of 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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. Further, the entirety of the mark is reproduced and recognizable within the disputed domain name and accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds that the addition of the term "gorup" – a misspelling of the term "group" – does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 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 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 and the evidence provided by the Complainant, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name as required under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy as follows: that before notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the Respondent did not use or make demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide

offering of goods or services; that the Respondent has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name and that the Respondent has not made a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent was given an opportunity to rebut the Complainant's prima facie showing but did not do so 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.

In addition, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity such as phishing, as in this case, or other types of fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

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 notes that by the Respondent's conduct, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as set out in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Further, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity as applicable to this case: phishing, or other types of fraud constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. From the evidence provided by the Complainant, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name and used it to send a fraudulent email on the same day, to third parties, impersonating the Complainant. In the Panel's view, this shows that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark ahead of registering the disputed domain name. Having reviewed the record therefore, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under the Policy and 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 <alimakgorup.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Uwa Ohiku/

Uwa Ohiku

Sole Panelist

Date: June 19, 2026