

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson v. Shehryar Hassan
Case No. D2026-2741

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Shehryar Hassan, Sweden.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <v-ericsson.com> is registered with Internetx GmbH (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 24, 2026. On June 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 25, 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 25, 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 June 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 20, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 24, 2026. Shortly thereafter on the same day, the Respondent sent an email communication to the Center, and the Center sent an email to the Parties concerning a possible suspension of the proceedings for settlement discussions. On July 27, 2026, the Complainant confirmed to the Center that it did not wish to suspend the proceedings.

The Center appointed Petter Rindforth as the sole panelist in this matter on August 3, 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, a Swedish company founded in 1876, is a provider of communication technology and services around the world. The Complainant offers services, software and infrastructure in information and communications technology (ICT) for telecommunications operators, traditional telecommunications and Internet Protocol (IP) networking equipment, mobile and fixed broadband, operations and business support services, cable television, IPTV, video systems, and an extensive services operation.

The Complainant is the owner of the ERICSSON trademark, registered in several countries and regions, including:

- European Union Trade Mark registration No. 001459130 ERICSSON (word), registered on February 15, 2001, for goods and services in International Classes 9, 11, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 41, and 42;
- European Union Trade Mark registration No. 000107003 ERICSSON (figurative), registered on March 23, 1999 for goods and services in International Classes 9, 11, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41 and 42; and
- International Trademark registration No. 1024858 ERICSSON (figurative), registered on October 7, 2009, for goods and services in International Classes 9, 11, 16, 35, 36, 37, 38, 41, 42, and 45.

The Complainant's primary domain name is <ericsson.com>, was registered in 1989.

The Complainant has, prior to filing the Complaint, sent several cease-and-desist letters to the Respondent, with no response.

The disputed domain name <v-ericsson.com> was registered on November 14, 2025. It redirects Internet users to the Complainant's primary website, at "www.ericsson.com".

No further information is available on the Respondent, apart from what is stated by the Complainant. Based on the available record, there is no relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent.

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 Complainant's trademark ERICSSON is well-known, and that the Complainant's own website "www.ericsson.com" received 776.3 thousand of individual visits in April 2026.

The mere addition of the letter "v" to the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain name <v-ericsson.com> does not negate the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, at the time of filing the Complaint, the Respondent was using a privacy service, which past panels have also found to equate to a lack of legitimate interest.

It should also be noted that while no evidence has been found that the disputed domain name was actively used as part of a fraud, the presence of mail-exchange (MX) records on the domain name, coupled with the aforementioned redirection to the Complainant's own website, strongly implies that the disputed domain name could be used as part of an email phishing scheme in the future.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions. On July 24, 2026, the Respondent claimed, via an email communication to the Center to have "terminated" the disputed domain name, attaching a screen capture from "www.strato.se" which listed the disputed domain name as "Terminated to the 14/11/2026 00:00".

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 letter "v" followed by a hyphen before the Complainant's trademark, 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. 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 that the nature of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. Furthermore, the use of the disputed domain name to redirect to the Complainant's official website does not support a claim of rights or legitimate interests. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.3.

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.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes that the Complainant's trademark is globally well-known, the Respondent is based in Sweden, the home country of the Complainant, the disputed domain name clearly and in full incorporates the Complainant's trademark, and the disputed domain name redirects to the Complainant's own website, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark when registering the disputed domain name and aimed to target it.

Panels have consistently held that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a well-known trademark can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4. Moreover, and even though no evidence has been submitted in this regard, the Respondent could use the disputed domain name for fake e-mails/phishing, as the disputed domain name redirects to the Complainant's official website, and MX servers are associated with the disputed domain name.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute 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 <v-ericsson.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Petter Rindforth/

Petter Rindforth

Sole Panelist

Date: August 17, 2026