

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Philip Morris Products S.A. v. terea house
Case No. D2026-2591

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Philip Morris Products S.A., Switzerland, represented by Akran Intellectual Property, Italy.

The Respondent is terea house, Türkiye.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <tereahouse.com> is registered with Automattic Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 15, 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 June 16, 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, Knock Knock WHOIS Not There, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on the same date, 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 19, 2026.

On June 16, 2026, the Center informed the parties in Turkish and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is Turkish. On June 19, 2026, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding.

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 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5,

the due date for Response was July 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Kaya Köklü as the sole panelist in this matter on July 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 part of the Philip Morris International Inc. group, which is a group of companies active in the field of tobacco and smoke-free products.

According to the Complaint, the Complainant owns a large number of word and figurative TEREА trademark registrations around the globe. The Complainant is, among many others, the owner of the Turkish Trademark Registration No. 2019 128867, registered on September 17, 2020, for TEREА, covering protection, inter alia, for electronic cigarettes as protected in class 34.

The Respondent is reportedly located in Türkiye.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 21, 2025.

Screenshots, as provided by the Complainant, show that the disputed domain name resolves to a website, which is used for purportedly offering various kinds of smoke-free products of the Complainant. On the associated website, the TEREА and also other trademarks (including logos) as well as official product images of the Complainant are prominently used without a visible disclaimer describing the (lack of) relationship between the Parties. Moreover, on the associated website, the Respondent explicitly presents itself in the Turkish language as an “authorized seller”.

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.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Turkish. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that the Complainant has no knowledge of Turkish and that filing a translation of the Complaint would be time and costs intensive.

The Respondent did not make any specific submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding, even though communicated by the Center in Turkish and English.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above and bearing in mind that the Respondent has not objected the Complainant's request concerning the language of the proceeding, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2. Substantive Issues

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements is satisfied:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

As per paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the complainant bears the burden of proving that all these requirements are fulfilled, even if a respondent has not substantively replied to the complainant's contentions. *Stanworth Development Limited v. E Net Marketing Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1228](#).

Concerning the uncontested information provided by a complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the provided reasonable factual allegations in a complaint as true. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.3.

It is further noted that the Panel has taken note of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views captured therein.

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the TEREА trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

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

Although the addition of other terms, here "house", 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 TEREА 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. Particularly, the Complainant put forward that the Respondent is neither a business partner of the Complainant nor a licensee of its TEREА trademark and that the Respondent is not commonly known by the term “terea” in combination with “house”. 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.

In this regard, the Panel particularly believes that the Respondent cannot be assessed as a legitimate dealer for the Complainant’s products in light of *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#) (“Oki Data”) and thus is not entitled to use the disputed domain name accordingly. The criteria as set forth in “Oki Data” are not fulfilled in the present case. The Panel particularly notes that the website which is linked to the disputed domain name does not accurately and prominently disclose the relationship, or rather the lack thereof, between the Respondent and the Complainant, thus creating the false impression that the Respondent might be an official and/or authorized reseller/distributor for the Complainant’s products in Türkiye, further reinforced by the Respondent’s explicit claim on the associated website that it is an “authorized seller”. This assessment is supported by the nature of the disputed domain name, which comprises the entirety of the Complainant’s TEREА trademark in combination with the descriptive term “house”. In view of the Panel, all this takes the Respondent out of the “Oki Data” safe harbour for purposes of the second element.

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.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent must have had the Complainant and its TEREА trademark in mind when registering the disputed domain name. It is obvious to the Panel that the

Respondent has deliberately chosen the disputed domain name, which comprises the Complainant's trademarks in their entirety, to target and mislead Internet users searching for the Complainant and its products.

With respect to the use of the disputed domain name in bad faith, the Panel finds that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name in order to generate traffic to its own website by deliberately misleading third parties in a false belief that the associated website is either operated or at least authorized by the Complainant. The prominent use of the Complainant's TEREА mark, including further trademarks, logos and official product pictures of the Complainant, coupled with the Respondent's explicit claim that it is an "authorized seller" (without being authorized by the Complainant), is, in view of the Panel, sufficient evidence that the Respondent intentionally tries to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its TEREА trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the associated website.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

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 <tereahouse.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kaya Köklü/

Kaya Köklü

Sole Panelist

Date: July 24, 2026