

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Verband der Automobilindustrie e.V. (VDA) v. asya adblue, petrol urunleri
Case No. D2026-2570

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Verband der Automobilindustrie e.V. (VDA), Germany, represented by Kroher Strobel Rechts- und Patentanwälte PartmbB, Germany.

The Respondent is asya adblue, petrol urunleri, Türkiye.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <asyaadblue.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 12, 2026. On June 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same date, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 16, 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 17, 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 17, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 7, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Jeremy Speres as the sole panelist in this matter on July 14, 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.

The Panel issued Procedural Order No. 1 on July 15, 2026, requesting further information from the Complainant, giving the Complainant and the Respondent until July 18, and July 23, 2026, respectively, to respond. The Complainant responded on July 20, 2026 – the next working day after the deadline. The Respondent did not respond.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is an interest group of the German automotive industry, including both automobile manufacturers and automobile component suppliers. The Complainant pursues the interests of the German automotive industry in sectors such as the aftermarket, electric mobility, logistics, and customs and excise. Among its responsibilities, the Complainant is entrusted with protecting the Complainant's ADBLUE trademark, which is used for urea that reduces the Nitrogen Oxide ("NOx") emissions of diesel engines, particularly in the field of commercial and heavy goods vehicles, and which is produced by the Complainant's licensed manufacturers.

The Complainant's ADBLUE mark is registered in various jurisdictions, including in the Respondent's purported jurisdiction of Türkiye under Trademark Registration No. 2012 17438 ADBLUE (word) in classes 4, 6, 7, 9, 12, 20, 35, 37, 39, and 42, having a registration date of October 17, 2014.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 7, 2026, and resolves to a website in Turkish entitled "ARYA PPF GARAJ", offering paint protection film and other products for the protection of motor vehicles.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a cancellation of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith in order to benefit from confusion with the Complainant's mark for the Respondent's commercial gain, specifically by using the disputed domain name in connection with a website offering automotive-related goods and services.

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 “asya”, 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 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. As discussed below in relation to bad faith, the Panel accepts that the Complainant’s ADBLUE mark enjoys a reputation in the automotive industry, and the disputed domain name incorporates the mark in its entirety and is used in relation to the same industry. 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 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.

For the following reasons, the Panel finds that it is more likely than not that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name to take advantage of confusion with the Complainant’s mark for the Respondent’s commercial gain.

The Complainant claims that its mark is well known, but the evidence in the record is insufficient to support this. Nevertheless, the Panel has independently¹ conducted Internet searches for “adblue”, and the results overwhelmingly relate to the Complainant’s offering. The Panel is therefore prepared to accept that the mark enjoys a reputation within the automotive industry.

¹ In accordance with its powers articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, the Panel is entitled to conduct limited independent research into matters of public record. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.8.

The Panel has established that “asya” means “Asia” in Turkish. The composition of the disputed domain name combines the Complainant’s reputed mark with this geographic term, which points to targeting. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The Panel has also established that the disputed domain name’s website includes “Asya Adblue” within the website’s HyperText Markup Language (“HTML”) tag, resulting in “Asya Blue” being displayed in the user’s browser tab and as the clickable headline in search engine results for the website. This prominently creates the impression to users, in particular the Turkish users whom the website targets, that the website is in fact the Asian presence of the Complainant’s “AdBlue” brand.

In the circumstances, and given the Respondent’s apparent involvement in the automotive industry in which the Complainant’s mark enjoys a reputation, it is likely that the Respondent sought to take advantage of confusion with the Complainant, falling squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel draws an adverse inference from the Respondent’s failure to take part in the present proceedings where an explanation is certainly called for. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.3.

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 <asyaadblue.com> be cancelled.

/Jeremy Speres/

Jeremy Speres

Sole Panelist

Date: July 29, 2026