

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Aniara Ltd v. ABBA Arena London, ABBA Arena - London
Case No. D2026-3158

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Aniara Ltd, United Kingdom, represented by Sheridans Solicitors, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is ABBA Arena London, ABBA Arena - London, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <abbaarenalondon.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 17, 2026. On July 17, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 20, 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 21, 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 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 11, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 12, 2026.

The Complainant filed an unsolicited supplemental filing on August 14, 2026.

The Center appointed Luca Barbero 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 was incorporated on July 18, 2019, and is the production company of the ABBA Voyage immersive concert ("the Concert"), showcasing the greatest hits from the global supergroup ABBA, held since the first show in 2022 at the exclusive, purpose-built venue ABBA Arena, which coincides with the Complainant's registered address.

The Complainant is part of a group associated with the Concert, which includes Goldonder AB and is wholly owned by Goldonder Investors AB ("the Group"). The Complainant operates as the trading entity of the Group. The Group holds specific rights granted under a grand rights agreement with Polar Music International AB and pertinent ABBA group members, allowing for the production and management of the Concert. From the Concert's initiation over four years ago, the Group, with permission from the trademark holder and relevant parties, has sub-licensed these rights to the Complainant, which is identified as the Concert's producer, operates the official website for the Concert, uses related trademarks in promotional materials and domain name registrations and is responsible for the enforcement of the relevant rights since the inception of the Concert.

In virtue of the above, the Complainant is the licensee of the following trademark registrations owned by Polar Music International AB:

- United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK00003688194 for ABBA VOYAGE (figurative mark), filed on August 31, 2021, and registered on December 10, 2021, in classes 9, 16, 18, 25, and 41;

- United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK00004337856 for ABBA ARENA (word mark), filed on February 9, 2026, and registered on May 22, 2026, in international classes 9, 10, 16, 18, 25, and 41.

The Complainant is also the owner of domain names encompassing the ABBA ARENA mark as well as of the domain name <abbavoyage.com>, registered on February 8, 2021, and used in connection with the Complainant's official website, which provides information on the Concert and related ticketing services. The Complainant's website displays the ABBA VOYAGE and ABBA ARENA marks and various images and clips of the Concert.

The disputed domain name <abbaarenalondon.com> was registered on July 30, 2025, and currently resolves to a website indicating to be "an independent, unofficial guide to resale tickets" for the Concert. The website includes a disclaimer in small characters at the top of the website reading: "Independent fan-run guide. We are not ABBA Arena London, ABBA Voyage, or an official box office. Ticket links are affiliate links to Viagogo, a resale marketplace." An additional disclaimer at the bottom of the website reads: "abbaarenalondon.com is an independent, fan-operated ticket resale guide. We are not ABBA Arena London, ABBA Voyage, Pophouse, or any official box office, and we are not affiliated with, endorsed by, or connected to them. All trademarks belong to their respective owners. Ticket links go to Viagogo, an independent resale marketplace; we may earn a commission on purchases". However, according to the records, the disputed domain name resolved prior to the filing of the Complaint to a website publishing the ABBA ARENA and ABBA VOYAGE marks and the Complainant's copyrighted Concert material, also reproducing the Complainant's identical white and orange brand colorway.

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 it has rights in the ABBA ARENA mark based on the license granted by the trademark holder to use and enforce the rights in relation to the Concert. The Complainant submits that, irrespective of the Complainant being a non-exclusive licensee, the following considerations may demonstrate the trademark owner's implicit consent to the Complainant's filing of the Complaint and therefore demonstrate the Complainant has shown rights for the purposes of the Policy: i) the Complainant has been using the ABBA ARENA mark in extensive trading activities including advertising; ii) the Complainant has registered numerous domain names encompassing the ABBA ARENA mark; iii) the Complainant's mark ABBA ARENA forms part of the Complainant's official registered company address; and iv) the Complainant has been using the marks ABBA and ABBA VOYAGE for over four years. The Complainant also submits that the trademark holder has been informed of the disputed domain name and consented to the filing of the Complaint by the Complainant.

The Complainant states that significant unregistered rights in and to the ABBA ARENA have been established from the inception of the Concert over four years ago and that the mark has become a significant source identifier for the Complainant and the Concert.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark ABBA ARENA in which the Complainant has rights as it reproduces the trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the term "London", which increases the false association with the ABBA ARENA mark and the Complainant.

The Complainant states that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name since:

- i) the Respondent has in no way been authorized, licensed or permitted to register and use the disputed domain name encompassing the ABBA ARENA mark;
- ii) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name;
- iii) the Respondent registered the disputed domain name misrepresenting itself as "Abba Arena London" and indicating the Complainant's address;
- iv) the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, considering that the disputed domain name has been directed to a website purporting to be an official ticket website for the Concert, using the ABBA ARENA mark, the Complainant's copyrighted Concert material and the Complainant's identical white and orange brand colorway, providing affiliate links to an actual seller of the tickets, earning a commission on purchases. The Complainant also highlights that the Respondent initially only mentioned that its website was "unaffiliated / unofficial" but no clear disclaimer was provided.

The Complainant claims that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith since:

- i) the Complainant's rights in the ABBA ARENA mark long predate the registration of the disputed domain name;

- ii) the mark is inextricably linked to the Complainant and the Concert and is only understood within this context and for the ABBA supergroup;
- iii) the registration and use of the disputed domain name and the related website demonstrates actual knowledge;
- iv) the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to take commercial advantage and exploit the continued success of the Concert;
- v) the Respondent used the disputed domain name to falsely advertise limited Concert shows by including a promotional banner on the website stating: "PLAYING UNTIL OCTOBER 2026" purportedly to increase sales due to false scarcity; and
- vi) as shown by the historical screenshots saved by the Internet Archive www.archive.org, in August 2025, the website at the disputed domain name appeared as a generic template, possibly leading consumers to question its legitimacy and discouraging ticket purchases through the Respondent's affiliate links and, consequently, the Respondent subsequently changed the content of its website increasing references to the ABBA ARENA and ABBA VOYAGE marks, providing details about the ABBA Arena and publishing numerous copyrighted images, both from the Complainant and a third party, in order to mislead consumers and boost the Respondent's commercial gain at the Complainant's expense.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent's bad faith is also highlighted by the following circumstances:

- i) the Complainant received a letter in April 2026 from a misled German lawyer on behalf of his photographer client in which it was requested to cease use of a copyrighted image published on the website at the disputed domain name;
- ii) the disputed domain name is disrupting the Complainant's business and has caused actual damage and actual loss to the Complainant (in terms of legal fees);
- iii) the Respondent has affiliate links on its related website to redirect Internet users to a competing third-party ticket website for the Respondent's commercial gain;
- iv) the Respondent's website has vague and poorly placed disclaimers to obfuscate the Respondent's lack of legitimate rights and lack of relationship; and
- v) the Respondent has provided false and incomplete contact details, which is considered evidence of use and registration in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Supplemental Filings

Before entering into the merits of the case, the Panel addresses the issue of the unsolicited supplemental filings submitted by the Complainant to the Center.

No provision concerning supplemental filings is made in the Rules or Supplemental Rules, except at the request of the panel according to paragraph 12 of the Rules, which states that the panel, in its sole discretion, may request any further statements or documents from the parties it may deem necessary to decide the case.

According to paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel has the authority to determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence, and also to conduct the proceedings with due expedition, ensuring that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case.

As stated in section 4.6 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), unsolicited supplemental filings are generally discouraged - unless specifically requested by the panel - and the party submitting an unsolicited supplemental filing should clearly show its relevance to the case and why it was unable to provide the information contained therein in its complaint or response.

Accordingly, UDRP panels generally accept supplemental filings only when they provide material new evidence or a fair opportunity to respond to arguments that could not reasonably have been anticipated. See, along these lines, *Welcomemat Services, Inc. v. Michael Plummer Jr., MLP Enterprises Inc.*, WIPO Case No. D2017-0481.

The Panel notes that, in its supplemental filing – which was submitted only to the Center without the Respondent in copy – the Complainant has provided comments on changes to the Respondent's website, which were made by the Respondent after the filing of the Complaint. While this is a new element that the Complainant could not be aware of prior to the filing of the Complaint, the Panel has considered the circumstances of the case, the Respondent's default and the need to conduct the proceeding with due expedition and has decided not to admit such Supplemental Filing and not to allow further submission from the Respondent in order to avoid delays in the proceedings.

Nevertheless, the Panel notes that, should the Panel have admitted the Complainant's supplemental filing, the outcome of the case would have been the same.

6.2. Substantive Issues

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules: "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable." Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following:

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

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

As stated in section 1.4.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), an exclusive trademark licensee is considered to have rights in a trademark under the UDRP for purposes of standing to file a complaint. While panels have been prepared to infer the existence of authorization to file a UDRP case based on the facts and circumstances described in the complaint, which may be supported by information that is publicly available online, they may expect parties to provide an explanation of the relationship between the entities and/or relevant evidence of authorization to file a UDRP complaint, especially if the companies are not named in the complaint as co-complainants. In this respect, absent clear authorization from the trademark owner, a non-exclusive trademark licensee would typically not have standing to file a UDRP complaint.

In the case at hand, based on the documents and statements provided by the Complainant and referenced under sections 4 and 5.A above, the Panel finds that the Complainant has demonstrated that it owns license rights in respect of the ABBA ARENA mark for the purpose of standing in this proceeding.

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The entirety of the ABBA ARENA 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, "London" 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.

As to the generic Top-Level Domain ".com", it is a standard registration requirement and can be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Therefore, 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.

According to the evidence on record, there is no relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent, and the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to register or use its trademark or the disputed domain name.

Moreover, there is no element from which the Panel could infer the Respondent's rights over the disputed domain name, or that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Panel notes that, in the circumstances of this case, the Respondent's indication of "ABBA Arena London" as registrant name for the disputed domain name suggests an attempt to impersonate the Complainant. Such conclusion is supported by the indication of the Complainant's address as registrant address for the disputed domain name as well as by the content of the website to which the disputed domain name resolved as detailed below.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here, claimed passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Indeed, the Complainant has provided evidence – that the Respondent has not challenged – showing that the disputed domain name resolved, prior to this proceeding, to a website displaying the ABBA ARENA and ABBA VOYAGE marks and the Complainant's official images, mimicking the Complainant's website and creating the impression that it was the official website for purchase of tickets for the Concert. The Panel finds that the changes made to the website, with the addition of disclaimers in small characters as to the lack of affiliation with the trademark owner, are not sufficient for the Respondent to claim to have made a bona fide offering of goods or services under the disputed domain name since they were made after the Respondent received notice of the dispute. Moreover, the Panel notes that the website was not intended to actually offer tickets for sale but to redirect users to third-party websites where purported tickets for the Concert could be purchased. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8.1. Furthermore, the disputed domain name has not been used for a legitimate noncommercial or fair use as the Respondent's intent for commercial gain is clearly highlighted by the statements published on the website, indicating that the website is linked to "an independent resale marketplace", and that the Respondent "may earn a commission".

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name, combining the ABBA ARENA mark with the geographic term "London" referring to the place where the Complainant is based and operates, is inherently misleading as it suggests an affiliation with the Complainant. Even where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Therefore, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has also 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.

In the present case, the Panel finds that in view of: i) the prior registration of the ABBA VOYAGE mark by the Complainant's licensor; ii) the use of the ABBA ARENA mark in connection with the place where the Concert has been held since 2022; iii) the Complainant's promotion of the Concert via its website "www.abbavoyage.com"; and iv) and the Complainant's global reach on the Internet and on search engines, the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant and its trademark rights at the time of registration. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2. The Panel finds that the Respondent not only targeted the ABBA VOYAGE mark, but also intended to register the disputed domain name in anticipation of the nascent rights in ABBA ARENA after the Complainant started operating the Concert in 2022. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.8.2.

The composition of the disputed domain name, encompassing the ABBA ARENA mark with the geographic term "London" referring to the place where the Complainant is located, and the references to the Complainant and the ABBA ARENA and ABBA VOYAGE marks on the website to which the disputed domain name resolve suggest that the Respondent was indeed aware of, and intended to target, the Complainant through the registration and use of the disputed domain name.

The Panel also finds that, in view of the direction of the disputed domain name to the website described above, promoting the sale of tickets for the Concert through affiliate links to third-party websites, publishing the ABBA ARENA and ABBA VOYAGE marks without providing sufficiently prominent and clear disclaimers of non-affiliation with the Complainant or its licensor and also creating the impression that it was the Complainant's official website prior to the filing of the Complaint, the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the

trademarks in which the Complainant has rights as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website according to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Respondent's provision of false contact information at the time of registration, namely, the Complainant's registered address and a registrant organization clearly aimed at impersonating the Complainant, further supports a finding of bad faith.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy as well.

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 <abbaarenalondon.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Luca Barbero/

Luca Barbero

Sole Panelist

Date: August 28, 2026