ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Mama Margaret sp. z o.o. sp. k. v. danny sullivan
Case No. D2026-2893

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Mama Margaret sp. z o.o. sp. k., Poland, internally represented.

The Respondent is danny sullivan, United States of America ("US").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <seltino.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 2, 2026. On July 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 6, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 7, 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 July 8, 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 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Rebecca Slater as the sole panelist in this matter on August 14, 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 Polish company that manufactures and distributes air and water filters under the SELTINO brand. The Complainant claims its business has operated since 2009 and currently processes approximately 15,000 orders per month. The Complainant's products are sold through major online marketplaces, including Allegro, Poland's largest marketplace.

The Complainant is the owner of European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 012309341 for the SELTINO word mark (registered March 26, 2014) and European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 012309324 for the SELTINO figurative mark (registered April 14, 2014) (together, the "Trade Mark").

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name served as the principal website for its business for approximately a decade. It has submitted in evidence domain name renewal invoices issued to the Complainant in 2016, 2022, and 2023 by the disputed domain name's previous registrar. The Complainant also operates a portfolio of country-code domain names, including <seltino.eu>, <seltino.fr>, and <seltino.co.uk>. The Complainant's registration of the disputed domain name lapsed in October, 2024, due to an administrative oversight.

The Respondent is an individual, apparently located in the US. According to the publicly available information on a website associated with the Respondent, the Respondent is "an avid domain name investor" who applies portfolio-management processes to his portfolio of domain names. His associated venture, Domain V.A. (also operating under the "Agents of Value" brand), offers domain-portfolio services to other domain investors. As the Respondent did not submit a Response, no other information is available about the Respondent.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on December 13, 2024. At the date of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a parking page displaying pay-per-click ("PPC") advertising links in categories relating to the Complainant's products (including "Replacement water filters", "Drinking water filters" and "Water filtration systems") and the statement "seltino.com may be for sale, click to inquire", linking an offer form operated by "Above.com" with a minimum offer of USD 1,000.

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 Trade Mark. The disputed domain name captures the Trade Mark in its entirety and without addition.
- The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. It is not commonly known by the name "Seltino" and has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to use the Trade Mark. The Respondent makes no bona fide offering of goods or services under the disputed domain name. Instead, the disputed domain name is parked on a monetization platform, displays PPC links in categories directly relating to the Complainant's products, and is offered for sale.

- The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The following support this contention:
- The Respondent acquired the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling it for valuable consideration in excess of its documented out-of-pocket costs. When the Complainant sought to recover the disputed domain name, the Respondent demanded USD 5,200 through its broker and did not engage further when the Complainant declined. The disputed domain name is simultaneously offered for sale to the general public.
- The Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant and its rights. The Trade Mark predates the Respondent's registration by 11 years, the disputed domain had served as the Complainant's official website for approximately a decade, and the Respondent's server continued to display the Complainant's original website content under the disputed domain name after the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name. The Trade Mark is a coined term with no dictionary meaning, and there is no plausible good faith reason to register the disputed domain name other than to target the Trade Mark.
- The disputed domain name resolves to a parking page displaying PPC links for water filter products, capitalizing on confusion with the Trade Mark for commercial gain.
- The Respondent's use of a privacy shield to conceal its identity, in combination with the above circumstances, further supports an inference of bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, namely:

- the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The onus of proving these elements is on the Complainant.

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 trade mark 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 trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Trade Mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the Trade 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.

The Panel notes that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a high risk of implied affiliation. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1. In this regard, the Panel notes the Complainant has provided evidence that it was a previous owner of the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the Trade Mark and there is no evidence that the Respondent has ever been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name is being used to host a website displaying PPC links, including to various water filtration products. This does not represent a bona fide offering as such links capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the Trade Mark. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.9.

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

Under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, there is evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith where a respondent has used the disputed domain name to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trade marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website.

The Panel finds it unlikely that the disputed domain name was registered without knowledge of the Complainant and the Trade Mark, given the reputation of both the Complainant and the Trade Mark. The Respondent's goal in registering and using the disputed domain name appears to be to attract Internet users for potential gain by taking unfair advantage of and creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Trade Mark. This finding is reinforced by: (a) the timing of the registration of the disputed domain name (two months after the Complainant failed to renew its registration after its decade-long use of the domain name); and (b) the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to host a website displaying PPC links in categories relating to the Complainant's products which likely generate revenue for the Respondent.

In these circumstances, it is reasonable to infer that the by offering the disputed domain name for sale the Respondent has intended to capitalize on the reputation and goodwill inherent in the Trade Mark.

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 <seltino.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Rebecca Slater/
Rebecca Slater
Sole Panelist
Date: August 28, 2026