

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson v. Ericsson USA, ericssonusa
Case No. D2026-2415

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Ericsson USA, ericssonusa, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ericssonusa.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 3, 2026. On June 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 4, 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 June 5, 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 June 9, 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 June 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 30, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 1, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrea Cappai as the sole panelist in this matter on July 6, 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. The record indicates that the Complainant operates internationally as a provider of communication technology, software, infrastructure, and related services.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for ERICSSON, including the following:

- ERICSSON, Canadian registration number UCA25436 with a registration date of September 25, 1946;
- ERICSSON (figurative), United States number 1313196 with a registration date of January 8, 1985; and
- ERICSSON (figurative), International registration number 1024858 with a registration date of October 7, 2009.

The Complainant operates an official website at the domain name <ericsson.com>, registered in 1989.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 29, 2025. The associated email address of the Respondent incorporates the term “ericsson”, together with the elements “hr” and “mana”.

The evidence submitted with the amended Complaint shows that an attempt to access the disputed domain name resulted in a connection error. The record does not disclose any substantive website operated by the Respondent through the disputed domain name.

The record further shows that mail exchange (“MX”) records exist for the disputed domain name.

The Respondent appears to be located in the United States. No further information regarding the Respondent is available in the record.

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 is confusingly similar to its ERICSSON trademark because it reproduces the mark in its entirety with the addition of the geographical term “usa”. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, as the Complainant has not authorised the Respondent to use its trademark and the registrant information disclosed by the Registrar does not establish that the Respondent is genuinely commonly known by the disputed domain name. In this regard, the Complainant relies on the registrant name, the organisation name “ericssonusa”, the disclosed email address, and the absence of any corresponding entity identified in the relevant business registry search submitted with the amended Complaint. The Complainant also submits that the Respondent has made no bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, relying on the longstanding and internationally known character of the ERICSSON mark, the composition of the disputed domain name, the registrant information disclosed by the Registrar, the non-use of the disputed domain name, and the configuration of MX records. The Complainant also relies on the Respondent’s use of a privacy service at the time the Complaint was filed and the absence of any reply to three cease-and-desist communications sent through the privacy service’s contact form.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

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

Although the addition of other terms here, the geographical term "usa", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 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 recognised 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 has considered the disclosed registrant information, which identifies the Respondent using a name corresponding to the disputed domain name and lists "ericssonusa" as the organisation name. While such information may be relevant under paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy, it is not, by itself, sufficient to establish that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Here, the disclosed name reproduces the Complainant's ERICSSON mark together with the geographical term "usa", while the contact email address provided to the Registrar likewise incorporates the Complainant's

ERICSSON mark together with the elements “hr” and “mana”. The Complainant denies any affiliation with or authorisation of the Respondent, and the search results submitted by the Complainant do not identify any business entity named “ericssonusa” in the address associated with the Respondent as identified in the Registrar’s verification reply. The Respondent has not come forward with any evidence that it has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or by the name “ericssonusa”, nor has it otherwise explained the registrant information.

Moreover, the composition of the disputed domain name itself reinforces the absence of rights or legitimate interests. By combining the Complainant’s distinctive ERICSSON trademark with the geographical term “usa”, the disputed domain name naturally conveys the impression of a United States operation or presence of the Complainant. In these circumstances, the disputed domain name carries a clear risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. In the absence of any explanation from the Respondent, the Panel is unable to identify any plausible legitimate use of the disputed domain name that would not falsely suggest such an association.

The Panel finds 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name long after the Complainant had obtained registered rights in the ERICSSON mark.

The record shows that the Complainant is a long-established international provider of communication technology and related services, with a substantial global presence and a well-established position in the market.

The composition of the disputed domain name is significant. It reproduces the Complainant’s ERICSSON mark in its entirety and adds the geographical term “usa”. The resulting composition is apt to suggest a United States presence associated with the Complainant.

That inference is reinforced by the registrant information disclosed by the Registrar. The disclosed registrant name and organisation name correspond to the composition of the disputed domain name, while the associated email address also incorporates the ERICSSON mark together with the elements “hr” and “mana”, which may be understood as Ericsson HR Management. Taken together, these circumstances support the inference that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant and its trademark in mind.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or “coming soon” page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, and the Respondent’s lack of response, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds 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 <ericssonusa.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Cappai/

Andrea Cappai

Sole Panelist

Date: July 20, 2026