ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson v. Edgar Hettinger
Case No. D2026-2721

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Edgar Hettinger, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ericsson5g.com> (the "Domain Name") is registered with Amazon Registrar, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 23, 2026. On June 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On June 23, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (On behalf of ericsson5g.com OWNER c/o whoisproxy.com) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 24, 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 29, 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 July 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 22, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Gregor Vos as the sole panelist in this matter on August 5, 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

Founded in 1876, the Complainant is a global provider of communication technology and services. The Complainant offers, inter alia, services, software and infrastructure in the field of information and communications technology, including telecommunications networks, mobile and fixed broadband and 3G, 4G and 5G technology. The Complainant employs more than 88,000 people worldwide and reported net sales of SEK 69.3 billion in the fourth quarter of 2025. The Complainant also has a significant online presence, including more than 765,000 followers on Facebook.

The Complainant is the owner of, inter alia, the following trademark registrations (hereinafter referred to as the “Trademarks”):

- Australian trademark registration No. 322638 for ERICSSON (word), registered on October 3, 1978;
- European Union trademark registration No. 000107003 for ERICSSON (figurative), registered onMarch23, 1999; and
- United States trademark registration No. 2665187 for ERICSSON (word), registered on December 24, 2002.

In addition, the Complainant is the owner of the domain name <ericsson.com>, registered on July 25, 1989.

The Domain Name was registered on April 7,2026. At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the Domain Name resolved to an inactive page. Currently, the Domain Name continues to resolve to an inactive website.

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 Domain Name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Trademarks of the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, and the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Firstly, the Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Trademarks. The Domain Name incorporates the Trademarks in their entirety, with the mere addition of the descriptive term “5G” which is closely linked to the Complainant’s business as the Complainant is active in the development and supply of 5G technology. This does not preclude a finding of confusing similarity. Furthermore, the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com” is considered a standard registration requirement and therefore may be disregarded for purposes of assessing confusing similarity.

Secondly, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. The Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the Trademarks or to register any domain name incorporating the Trademarks. Furthermore, the Respondent is not commonly known by the Domain Name. The Complainant further refers to the Respondent’s use of a privacy service as an additional circumstance supporting its contention that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. In addition, the Domain Name resolves to a blank webpage without substantive content, and the Respondent has failed to demonstrate any attempt to make legitimate use of the Domain Name.

Finally, according to the Complainant, the Respondent has registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith. The Trademarks predate the Domain Name by many years and are known internationally. Considering the composition of the Domain Name, the Complainant contends that the Respondent must have been aware of and specifically targeted the Complainant and its Trademarks when registering the Domain Name, also because the term "5G" is closely related to the Complainant's business. The Complainant further submits that the passive holding of the Domain Name does not prevent a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this case. The Complainant also refers to the Respondent's use of a privacy service and its failure to respond to the Complainant's cease-and-desist communications.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

For the Complainant to succeed, it must prove, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy and on the balance of probabilities that:

i. the Domain Name is identical, or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

ii. the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and

iii. the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Only if all three elements have been fulfilled, the Panel is able to grant the remedies requested by the Complainant. The Panel will deal with each of the requirements in turn.

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 Trademarks and the 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 Trademarks is reproduced within the Domain Name. Accordingly, the 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, "5G") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of this term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the Trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

Furthermore, it is well established that the gTLD ".com" in the Domain Name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.

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 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 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 Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel notes that the Domain Name incorporates the Trademarks in their entirety together with the term "5G", which is directly related to the Complainant's activities. In the circumstances of the present case, the Panel finds that the composition of the Domain Name suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant and therefore carries a risk of implied affiliation. Accordingly, the composition of the Domain Name prevents a finding of rights or legitimate interests. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

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.

The Panel notes that previous UDRP panels have recognized the reputation of the Complainant's Trademarks (see for example: *Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson v. John S, Ericsson, Phoenix King, ericsson-usa*, WIPO Case No. D2025-4633; *Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson v. eryuesheng song*, WIPO Case No. D2024-0019; *Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson v. 苏剑锋 (su jian feng)*, WIPO Case No. D2024-3573; and *Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson v. Himanshu Jain, IDS*, WIPO Case No. D2025-0977). Having regard to the evidence submitted by the Complainant concerning the longstanding use of the Trademarks, the scale of its business and its significant online presence, the Panel agrees that the Trademarks enjoy a reputation.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the registration of the Trademarks predates the registration of the Domain Name. Having regard to the reputation of the Trademarks and the fact that the Domain Name incorporates the Trademarks in their entirety, together with the term "5G" which is directly linked to the Complainant's activities, the Panel agrees with the Complainant that it is not conceivable that the Respondent chose the Domain Name without knowledge of the Complainant, its activities, and the Trademarks under which the Complainant is doing business.

Moreover, in the circumstances of this case, the Respondent’s use of a privacy service further supports the Panel’s finding of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.6. In addition, previous UDRP panels have held that a respondent’s failure to reply to cease-and-desist letters may reinforce an inference of bad faith.

In addition, Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness of the Trademarks and the composition of the Domain Name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the 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 Domain Name <ericsson5g.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gregor Vos/
Gregor Vos
Sole Panelist
Date: August 19, 2026