

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Eden Foods, Inc. v. Muhammad Shoaib Na
Case No. D2026-2852

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Eden Foods, Inc., United States of America (“United States” or “U.S.”), represented by Wiley Rein LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Muhammad Shoaib Na, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <edenfoodsheadoffice.com> is registered with Atak Domain Hosting Internet ve Bilgi Teknolojileri Limited Sirketi d/b/a Atak Teknoloji (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 30, 2026. On July 1, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 2, 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 (DOMAIN ADMINISTRATOR / APINAME Ltd) 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 July 7, 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 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 29, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 30, 2026.

The Center appointed Mireille Buydens as the sole panelist in this matter on August 4, 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 a producer of natural and organic food and beverage products founded in the sixties in the U.S. and active mostly in the U.S. under the “EDEN” and “EDEN FOODS” brands.

The Complainant holds various trademark registrations for EDEN and EDEN FOODS (hereafter “the EDEN Trademark”, “the EDEN FOODS Trademark”, or “the Trademark(s)”), including the following:

- Australian trademark registration no. 840835 for EDEN (word mark), registered on June 27, 2003;
 - U.S. trademark registration no. 1452337 for EDEN (word mark), registered on August 11, 1987;
 - U.S. trademark registration no. 4431041 for EDEN (word mark), registered on November 12, 2013;
- and
- U.S. trademark registration no. 3071337 for EDEN FOODS (word mark), registered on March 21, 2006.

The Complainant owns the domain name <edenfoods.com>, which it first registered in 1998 and is currently used for its official website.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 12, 2026. According to the Complaint, the website to which the disputed domain name resolves displays the EDEN Trademark in the upper left-hand corner, and pretends to offer professional visa and immigration services through food manufacturing and supply chain jobs in Canada. In order to apply for these purported opportunities, visitors are required to enter sensitive personal information, including their passport information, and pay substantial fees. At the date of this decision, the disputed domain name still resolves to a website proposing visa and employment services in Canada. The website also contains a footer stating “Copyright @ 2026 Eden Foods Inc. - EdenFoods.com”. There is no information available concerning the company operating the 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 disputed domain name.

First, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the EDEN and EDEN FOODS Trademarks which predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant asserts that it owns trademark registrations for the EDEN and EDEN FOODS Trademarks. In addition, the Complainant owns common law rights in the EDEN and EDEN FOODS marks as it has been actively and continuously using EDEN and EDEN FOODS to promote its products and services since 1967. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the EDEN and EDEN FOODS Trademarks, as it fully reproduces both the EDEN and EDEN FOODS Trademarks, with only the addition of the term “head office” and the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com”. The term “head office” is descriptive as it is frequently used in English to refer to the primary location of a business. The gTLD “.com” should be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

Second, the Complainant contends that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name as the Respondent is using it as part of a fraudulent scheme. The website under the disputed domain name purports to offer visa and immigration services on behalf of the Complainant (which however

does not offer these type of services), through jobs that do not exist, to induce Internet users to disclose highly sensitive personal information and transfer significant sums of money. As a result, it is not being used for any legitimate or bona fide offerings, and cannot confer rights or legitimate interests. Furthermore, the registrant information shows that the disputed domain name does not correspond to the Respondent's name.

Third, the Complainant contends that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its EDEN and EDEN FOODS Trademarks (used for decades in the U.S. and in Canada) prior to registering the disputed domain name. The Respondent adopted the precise EDEN and EDEN FOODS Trademarks, and then used these Trademarks on a website that purported to offer food industry jobs in Canada - indicating an awareness of the Complainant's business and geographic scope. Moreover, the Respondent paired the EDEN FOODS Trademark in the disputed domain name with the descriptive term "head office", to convey that the Respondent acts with the authority of the Complainant. This registration and usage indicate that the Respondent specifically selected the disputed domain name with an intent to leverage the goodwill associated with the EDEN FOODS Trademark for its own commercial gain. The Trademarks are being used to lend credibility to an employment and immigration website that has been recognized by a U.S. court and another domain dispute forum as a scam. Finally, the Respondent's bad faith is evident from the concealment of its identifying information.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Dealing with the Respondent's failure to file a response to the Complaint, paragraph 14(b) of the Rules provides that if a party, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, does not comply with a provision of, or requirement under these Rules, the Panel shall be entitled to draw such inferences from this omission, as it considers appropriate.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that the Complainant proves each of the following three elements in order to succeed in its Complaint:

- (i) the disputed 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 disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 Panel finds the EDEN and EDEN FOODS Trademarks are recognizable within the disputed domain name. The EDEN FOODS Trademark is reproduced in the disputed domain name with the mere addition of the term "head office". The EDEN Trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name with the addition of the terms "foods" and "head office". Although the addition of these terms may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a

finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Further, the gTLD “.com” is a standard registration requirement and should be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the EDEN and EDEN FOODS Trademarks for the purposes of the Policy.

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 Respondent is not licensed by, nor affiliated with, the Complainant in any way. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor is there any evidence of use or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services. There is no evidence of legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, either.

On the contrary, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name reproduces the EDEN FOODS Trademark with the mere addition of the descriptive term “head office” (which is the usual English term for designating the primary location of a business), and as such carries a risk of implied affiliation, which cannot constitute fair use as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. Even where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term, panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. In the case at hand, both the disputed domain name (which reproduces the EDEN and EDEN FOODS Trademarks with the mere addition of a descriptive suffix) and the website content (which depicts the EDEN and EDEN FOODS Trademarks and where the copyright notice in the footer directly suggests that the website is operated by the Complainant) indicate that the Respondent suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant and is using the disputed domain name for commercial gain by attempting to unduly benefit from the EDEN and EDEN FOODS Trademarks in order to generate traffic to its website.

The Panel also notes the impersonating nature of the website under the disputed domain name: the website depicts the EDEN and EDEN FOODS Trademarks on the upper left side of the website and contains a footer “Copyright © 2026 Eden Foods Inc. - EdenFoods.com”, thus directly referring to the Complainant and presenting the website as operated by the Complainant. As a result, the Respondent induces Internet users into falsely believing that the disputed domain name resolves to a website operated or endorsed by the

Complainant and allowing job candidates to get a visa for Canada with the help of the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed impersonation/passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Concerning the registration in bad faith, the Panel notes that the Respondent has composed the disputed domain name by combining the Complainant's EDEN FOODS Trademark with the descriptive term "head office" (describing in English the main place of business of a company). The Respondent paired the EDEN FOODS Trademark in the disputed domain name with the descriptive term "head office", to convey that the Respondent acts with the authority of the Complainant. This registration and usage indicate that the Respondent specifically selected the disputed domain name with an intent to leverage the goodwill associated with the EDEN FOODS Trademark for its own commercial gain. The Panel takes the view that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant's EDEN FOODS Trademark when it registered the disputed domain name and registered it with the intention to mislead Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name is affiliated with, or endorsed by, the Complainant. This conclusion is reinforced by the fact that, as explained above, the disputed domain name resolves to a website impersonating the Complainant. As a result, the Panel finds that the Respondent was more likely than not aware of the Complainant's Trademarks at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed impersonating or passing off constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. In the present case, the disputed domain name resolves to a website purportedly offering immigration and visa services, allegedly in the framework of recruitment activities of the Complainant. The Respondent passes itself off as the Complainant: the website prominently depicts the EDEN FOODS Trademark and contains the copyright notice "Copyright © 2026 Eden Foods Inc. - EdenFoods.com", which implies that the website under the disputed domain name directly claims to be operated by the Complainant. There is further no information available on the website concerning the company operating the website nor any disclaimer concerning the (lack of) relationship with the Complainant. Internet users are falsely induced to believe that the website under the disputed domain name is the recruitment site of the Complainant, offering help and assistance with visa and immigration in Canada (where the Complainant is also active). In light of this, it seems inconceivable that the Respondent would have registered and used the disputed domain name for a reason other than seeking to unduly benefit from the Complainant, its EDEN and EDEN FOODS Trademarks, and associated goodwill in order to attract Internet users on its website and to fraudulently have them providing personal information and paying (high) fees in the (false) hope to get a job in Canada.

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

/Mireille Buydens/

Mireille Buydens

Sole Panelist

Date: August 17, 2026