

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

The Kraft Heinz Company v. ANDRA LESMANA
Case No. D2026-2703

1. The Parties

The Complainant is The Kraft Heinz Company, United States of America ("United States"), represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is ANDRA LESMANA, Indonesia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <maxwellhouse.store> is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 22, 2026. On June 22, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 23, 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 23, 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 24, 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 25, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 15, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 16, 2026.

The Center appointed Federica Togo as the sole panelist in this matter on July 22, 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 operates in the food sector.

It results from the Complainant's undisputed allegations that it is an American multinational food company formed by the 2015 merger of Kraft Foods Group, Inc. and H.J. Heinz Company and that it is the parent company of the subsidiary entity that owns Maxwell House trademark registrations relevant to these proceedings. In addition, Maxwell House has been a staple coffee brand for Americans for over 125 years. In particular, the Complainant's subsidiary Kraft Foods Group Brands LLC owns United States Trademark Registration No. 599153 MAXWELL HOUSE, registered on December 7, 1954, for goods in class 30.

The Complainant uses the domain name <kraftheinz.com> for its primary website. In addition, the Complainant's MAXWELL HOUSE brand is featured and promoted at "www.kraftheinz.com/maxwell-house". It also uses the domain name <maxwellhouse.com> which redirects to Complainant's primary website.

The disputed domain name <maxwellhouse.store> was registered on August 5, 2025, and currently resolves to a website with gambling and gaming content, requesting users to login or register. Further, the undisputed evidence provided by the Complainant proves that the disputed domain name resolved to a web shop allegedly offering the Complainant's products and displaying without authorization the Complainant's trademark and logo.

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 identical to the Complainant's trademark MAXWELL HOUSE, because the second level domain of the disputed domain name consists solely of the Complainant's MAXWELL HOUSE trademark.

The Complainant contends that the MAXWELL HOUSE trademark is well recognized and respected worldwide and in its industry.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The Complainant has not given the Respondent permission to use the Complainant's trademarks in any manner, including in domain names. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, which evinces a lack of rights or legitimate interests. Furthermore, at the time of filing the Complaint, the Respondent was redacted for privacy purposes, which past panels have also found to equate to a lack of legitimate interest. The disputed domain name previously redirected Internet users to a website that attempted to duplicate the Complainant's online presence by passing off as an official Maxwell House website. As such, the disputed domain name's website was purposely designed as a means of deceiving internet users into believing that the disputed domain name and its website are associated with the Complainant. The Respondent's attempt to pass off the disputed domain name as being affiliated with the Complainant, and in fact as being the Complainant, is in itself evidence of the fact that the Respondent does not have rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to the Complainant, the Complainant and its MAXWELL HOUSE trademark are known internationally, with trademark registrations across numerous countries. Further, the disputed domain name was previously displaying the Complainant's logo and products on a website that attempted to sell Maxwell House products, attempting to cause confusion by passing off as an affiliate of the Complainant. As such, the Respondent has demonstrated a knowledge of and familiarity with the Complainant's brand and business. The impression given by the disputed domain name and its website would cause consumers to believe the Respondent is somehow associated with the Complainant when, in fact, it was not. The Respondent's actions created a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the disputed domain name, and the Respondent was thus using the fame of the Complainant's trademarks to improperly increase traffic to the website listed at the disputed domain name for the Respondent's own commercial gain. The Respondent, at the time of initial filing of the Complaint, had employed a privacy service to hide its identity, which past Panels have held serves as further evidence of bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "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 requires a complainant to prove each of the following three elements in order to obtain an order that the disputed domain name be transferred or cancelled:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark 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.

The Panel will therefore proceed to analyze whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied.

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.

In accordance with section 1.4.1 of [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), as the Complainant is the parent company of Kraft Foods Group Brands LLC that is the owner of MAXWELL HOUSE trademark registrations mentioned above in the Factual Background, the Panel considers that the Complainant has a standing to bring this UDRP 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.

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 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.

Moreover, the Panel notes that the nature of the disputed domain name carries a high risk of implied affiliation, since the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s trademark and to the Complainant’s official domain name. Generally speaking, previous UDRP panels have found that domain names identical to a complainant’s trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1). The Panel shares this view.

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 it results from the Complainant’s evidence that the disputed domain name resolved to a web shop allegedly offering Complainant’s products and displaying without authorization the Complainant’s trademark and logo. For the Panel, it is therefore evident that the Respondent positively knew the Complainant’s mark. Consequently, and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the Panel is convinced that the Respondent knew that the disputed domain name included the Complainant’s trademark when it registered the disputed domain name.

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.

On this regard, the further circumstances surrounding the disputed domain name’s registration and use confirm the findings that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith:

- 1) the nature of the disputed domain name (i.e. identical to the Complainant’s mark); in particular, the second level domain is identical to the Complainant’s mark MAXWELL HOUSE and the Top-Level Domain “.store” clearly indicates that it is a shop where the Complainant’s MAXWELL HOUSE products are sold;
- 2) the content of the website to which the disputed domain name resolved (i.e. web shop, allegedly offering the Complainant’s products and displaying without authorization the Complainant’s trademark and logo);

3) a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no response for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name.

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 <maxwellhouse.store> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Federica Togo/

Federica Togo

Sole Panelist

Date: August 4, 2026