

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

HATFIELD FARMS LIMITED v. Atud Prosper

Case No. D2026-3108

1. The Parties

The Complainant is HATFIELD FARMS LIMITED, United Kingdom, represented by Farrer & Co., United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Atud Prosper, Zango Tech, Cameroon.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <hatfieldfarmslimited.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 15, 2026. On July 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 17, 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 (Unknown Respondent) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 21, 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 amendment to the Complaint on July 24, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 29, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 18, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 26, 2026.

The Center appointed Torsten Bettinger as the sole panelist in this matter on September 1, 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, Hatfield Farms Limited, is a private limited company incorporated in England and Wales on July 26, 1977 under company number 01323075. The Companies House records show that the Complainant is active and that it has traded under the name Hatfield Farms Limited since the end of 1977. Its business activities include the production and sale of agricultural products and the letting and operation of property.

The Complainant relies on unregistered trademark rights in the names HATFIELD FARMS and HATFIELD FARMS LIMITED. According to the Complaint, the Complainant has traded continuously under the Hatfield Farms name for nearly five decades, with annual turnover of GBP 697,204 in 2024 and GBP 929,925 in 2025. The evidence also includes a May 2026 sales invoice issued under the name "Hatfield Farms Ltd" for the sale of wheat, displaying the Complainant's website at <hatfieldfarms.co.uk>.

The Companies House records further show that the Complainant changed its registered office in February 2023.

The disputed domain name <hatfieldfarmslimited.com> was registered on October 9, 2025. The Registrar disclosed the underlying registrant as Atud Prosper, Zango Tech, of Cameroon.

The disputed domain name resolves to a commercial website that presents itself as "Hat Field Farms Limited" and "Hatfield Farms Limited". The website promotes agricultural products, farm machinery and used equipment, and contains statements including "Top-Quality Farm Products & Used Equipment" and that it is a supplier of agricultural products "since 1984". It invites visitors to make commercial enquiries and purchases, including through "Contact Us", "Request Quote", and similar calls to action.

The website also reproduces the Complainant's former registered office address, and provides an email address using the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its name or former address.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to it and contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy.

With regard to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Complainant contends that:

- it has acquired unregistered trademark rights in HATFIELD FARMS and HATFIELD FARMS LIMITED through continuous trading under those names since 1977;
- the disputed domain name reproduces HATFIELD FARMS LIMITED in its entirety; and
- the ".com" Top-Level Domain is a standard registration element which does not prevent a finding of identity or confusing similarity.

With regard to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, the Complainant submits that:

- it has never authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use HATFIELD FARMS, HATFIELD FARMS LIMITED, or any similar designation;

- the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name; and
- the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name for a commercial website operating under the Complainant's name and reproducing the Complainant's former registered office address cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

With regard to paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the Complainant contends that:

- the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name because it reproduces the Complainant's company name in its entirety and the associated website reproduces the Complainant's former registered office address;
- the website presents itself as a longstanding agricultural enterprise under the name "Hat Field Farms Limited" and offers agricultural products and equipment for sale; and
- the Respondent has intentionally sought to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the goods and services promoted through it.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy states that the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements:

- (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 has been 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.

Where a complainant relies on unregistered trademark rights, it must show that the claimed mark has become a distinctive identifier which consumers associate with the complainant's goods or services. Relevant evidence may include the duration and nature of use of the mark, the amount of sales under the mark, the nature and extent of advertising, the degree of actual public recognition, and consumer surveys. Panels may also consider the nature of the disputed domain name and the respondent's use of it as relevant to whether the respondent has targeted the complainant's mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3.

In the present case, the evidence concerning the extent of the Complainant's use is not voluminous. Nevertheless, the Panel considers the record sufficient in the circumstances to establish unregistered trademark rights in HATFIELD FARMS LIMITED. The Complainant has traded under the Hatfield Farms name for nearly five decades; the record contains recent evidence of trading under that name; and the Complaint provides recent turnover figures.

The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant has established unregistered trademark rights in HATFIELD FARMS LIMITED for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3.

The disputed domain name reproduces HATFIELD FARMS LIMITED in its entirety. The Top-Level Domain ".com" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and is disregarded under the first element comparison.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's HATFIELD FARMS LIMITED mark for purposes of the Policy. 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 may result in the difficult task of proving a negative, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. Where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name, although the burden of proof remains on the complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

The Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the HATFIELD FARMS or HATFIELD FARMS LIMITED names. There is no evidence before the Panel that the Respondent is affiliated with the Complainant or has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Registrar-verified Respondent is identified as Atud Prosper, Zango Tech, which bears no apparent relationship to the disputed domain name.

The evidence shows that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name for a commercial website presenting itself as “Hat Field Farms Limited” and “Hatfield Farms Limited”, while reproducing the Complainant’s former registered office address and offering agricultural products and equipment. In the circumstances, such use does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services. Rather, it impersonates or passes off as the Complainant and creates the false impression of an association with it.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity such as impersonation, passing off, or other fraudulent conduct can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Respondent has not submitted any response and has not come forward with any evidence of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. The second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out circumstances, in particular but without limitation, that shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

The disputed domain name was registered approximately 48 years after the Complainant began trading under the Hatfield Farms name. It reproduces the Complainant’s company name and unregistered trademark HATFIELD FARMS LIMITED in its entirety.

More significantly, the associated website identifies itself as “Hat Field Farms Limited” and “Hatfield Farms Limited” and uses the Complainant’s former registered office address. The Panel considers that the Respondent’s selection of both the Complainant’s exact name and its former registered office address cannot reasonably be explained as coincidence. On the balance of probabilities, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with actual knowledge of and specifically targeting the Complainant.

The Respondent has used the disputed domain name for a plainly commercial website offering agricultural products, machinery, and other goods, while presenting itself as an established business under the Complainant’s name. The website invites users to contact the operator, request quotations, and purchase goods. In doing so, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain

by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's HATFIELD FARMS LIMITED mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the products offered through it. This conduct falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The website's use of the Complainant's former corporate address materially strengthens the conclusion that the Respondent's purpose was to impersonate the Complainant rather than independently to use a descriptive or coincidentally similar name. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for impersonation, passing off, or other fraudulent activity constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraphs 4(a)(iii) and 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <hatfieldfarmslimited.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Torsten Bettinger/

Torsten Bettinger

Sole Panelist

Date: September 14, 2026