

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Alimak Group Management AB v. Terry Holloway, Alimak
Case No. D2026-2959

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Alimak Group Management AB, Sweden, represented by Abion AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Terry Holloway, Alimak, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <alimakgr0up.com> are registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 6, 2026. On July 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 8, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name that differed from the named Respondent (Dynadot Privacy Service, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 8, 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 9, 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 14, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 3, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Nesrine Roudane as the sole panelist in this matter on August 20, 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, Alimak Group Management AB, is a Swedish limited liability company. It forms part of the Alimak Group, whose business dates back to 1948. Headquartered in Stockholm, Sweden, the Alimak Group provides permanent and temporary elevators, construction hoists, work platforms, height-safety equipment, and lifting and handling equipment, together with related maintenance, refurbishment, training, and after-sales services. The Alimak Group is listed on Nasdaq Stockholm, operates through sales offices, manufacturing and assembly facilities, and distributors worldwide, and employs approximately 3,000 people.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for ALIMAK in numerous jurisdictions, including:

- Swedish trademark registration No. 118501 for ALIMAK, registered on January 5, 1967, for goods in International Classes 6, 7, and 12;
- United States trademark registration No. 1673194 for ALIMAK, registered on January 28, 1992, for goods in International Class 7; and
- International trademark registration No. 1622403 for ALIMAK, registered on December 12, 2019, in International Classes 6, 7, 9, 12, 35, 37, 40, 41, and 42, designating, among other jurisdictions, the United States.

The Complainant also owns and uses the domain names <alimak.com>, registered on April 3, 1996, and <alimakgroup.com>, registered on March 26, 2015, in connection with its official online presence.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 17, 2026. At the time of the filing of the Complaint and the amended Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a parking page displaying sponsored pay-per-click links. Some of those links were related to the Complainant's field of business and were labelled "Industrial Vertical Access Solutions" and "Construction Hoists and Elevators". The evidence also shows that the disputed domain name had a Mail eXchange ("MX") record configured.

On June 18, 2026, the Complainant, through its representative, sent a cease-and-desist communication using the Registrar's online contact form and also contacted the Registrar, requesting that the communication be forwarded to the registrant. A reminder was sent to the Registrar on June 23, 2026. No response was received.

The Registrar disclosed the underlying registrant as Terry Holloway, United States, with "Alimak" entered in the organization field.

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 its ALIMAK trademark. The disputed domain name incorporates the trademark in its entirety, followed by the term "gr0up", in which the numeral "0" replaces the letter "o". According to the Complainant, this alteration does not prevent the ALIMAK trademark from being recognizable within the disputed domain name. On the contrary, the disputed domain name closely imitates the Complainant's company name and official domain name <alimakgroup.com>. The generic Top-Level Domain ".com" should be disregarded for the purposes of the comparison.

Second, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its ALIMAK trademark, and the Respondent is not affiliated with or otherwise connected to the Complainant. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or owns any corresponding trademark rights.

The Complainant submits that the inclusion of “Alimak” in the organization field of the registrant information does not establish that the Respondent is commonly known by that name. Rather, when considered together with the unrelated Gmail address and incomplete postal address disclosed by the Registrar, it was intended to create a false impression of association with the Complainant.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or for a legitimate noncommercial or fair purpose. Instead, the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page displaying sponsored pay-per-click links, including links related to the Complainant’s field of business. According to the Complainant, such use capitalizes on the reputation of its trademark and the confusion created by the disputed domain name.

Third, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The ALIMAK trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain name by many years and is distinctive and widely known. The composition of the disputed domain name, which combines the ALIMAK trademark with a typographical variation of “group”, demonstrates that the Respondent was aware of and deliberately targeted the Complainant, its trademark, company name, and official domain name when registering the disputed domain name.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has intentionally used the disputed domain name to attract Internet users to a parking page for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the ALIMAK trademark, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The presence of sponsored links relating to vertical access solutions, construction hoists, and elevators reinforces the connection with the Complainant and its business.

The Complainant also relies on the Respondent’s failure to reply to its cease-and-desist communications and on the existence of an MX record for the disputed domain name. It submits that the MX configuration creates a risk that the disputed domain name could be used for misleading email communications, particularly given its close visual similarity to the Complainant’s official domain name.

Accordingly, the Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to it.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires the Complainant to establish each of the following three elements:

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

The Respondent’s default does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant. The Complainant must still establish each of the three elements required under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. The Panel may, however, draw such inferences from the Respondent’s default as it considers appropriate in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules.

No preliminary procedural issue requires determination in this proceeding.

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 Selected UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the ALIMAK trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the ALIMAK trademark is reproduced and clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. The addition of the term "gr0up", in which the numeral "0" replaces the letter "o" in the word "group", does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is a standard registration requirement and is disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's ALIMAK trademark. The Panel finds that 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 a 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.

The Complainant has established that it has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its ALIMAK trademark and that the Respondent is not affiliated with or otherwise connected to the Complainant.

Although "Alimak" appears in the organization field of the registrant information disclosed by the Registrar, the record contains no evidence that the Respondent has genuinely been commonly known by the disputed domain name or by the name "Alimak". The mere listing of a name corresponding to the Complainant's trademark and part of the company name in the registrant information, without supporting evidence, does not establish rights or legitimate interests. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.3.

The disputed domain name resolves to a parking page containing sponsored pay-per-click links, including links relating to vertical access solutions, construction hoists and elevators. These links relate directly to the Complainant's field of business, which capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant's trademark. Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.9.

Furthermore, the composition of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant's trademark, and closely imitates the Complainant's company name and official domain name <alimakgroup.com>, carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant as Internet users may not notice the subtle misspelling of the word "group" in the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that 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 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 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.

The Complainant's ALIMAK trademark was registered and used many years before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. The Panel notes the distinctive nature of the ALIMAK trademark and the composition of the disputed domain name, which reproduces that trademark in its entirety and adds "gr0up", a typographical variation of the word "group". The disputed domain name thereby closely imitates both the Complainant's company name and its official domain name <alimakgroup.com>.

The Respondent also entered "Alimak" in the organization field of the registrant information. In the absence of any explanation from the Respondent, this fact, together with the composition of the disputed domain name, confirms that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its ALIMAK trademark when registering the disputed domain name and deliberately targeted them. The registration of the disputed domain name cannot reasonably be considered coincidental.

The disputed domain name has been used for a parking page displaying sponsored pay-per-click links. Certain links, including those labelled "Industrial Vertical Access Solutions" and "Construction Hoists and Elevators", directly relate to the Complainant's field of business. The Panel finds that, by using the disputed domain name in this manner, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's ALIMAK trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The fact that such links may have been generated automatically does not prevent a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.5.

The Panel further notes that the Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's cease-and-desist communications or provide any explanation for its registration and use of the disputed domain name. While the Respondent's failure to reply is not, by itself, conclusive of bad faith, it constitutes an additional factor supporting the Panel's finding in the circumstances of this case.

The evidence also shows that the disputed domain name had an MX record configured. Given the close visual similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's official domain name, such configuration could facilitate misleading email communications, presenting an implied threat to the Complainant. The record does not, however, establish that the disputed domain name has actually been used for phishing or other fraudulent email activity. In any event, the Panel's finding regarding the deliberate targeting of the Complainant and the use of the disputed domain name for commercial pay-per-click links are sufficient to establish bad faith.

Having reviewed the totality of the circumstances, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel therefore 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 <alimakgr0up.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nesrine Roudane/

Nesrine Roudane

Sole Panelist

Date: September 3, 2026