

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Volvo Trademark Holding Aktiebolag v. cars europa
Case No. D2026-3234

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Volvo Trademark Holding Aktiebolag, Sweden, represented by Zacco Sweden AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is cars europa, Germany.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <volvo-spain.com> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 22, 2026. On July 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 24, 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 (Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 27, 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 27, 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 August 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 27, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 28, 2026.

The Center appointed María Alejandra López García as the sole panelist in this matter on September 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 Volvo Trademark Holding AB, a company formed in 1999 to hold, manage, and preserve a unified identity of the intangible assets of the VOLVO name, including brand ownership, protection, and licensing. The Complainant is jointly and equally owned by AB Volvo (the Volvo Group) and the Volvo Car Corporation.

The Complainant also licenses the rights to use the trademarks to its shareholders, AB Volvo and Volvo Car Corporation. The VOLVO trademark enjoys a significant reputation worldwide and represents an enormous value for the Complainant since the VOLVO trademark has been used for nearly 100 years for a variety of products such as cars, trucks, buses, construction equipment, marine engines, and industrial power systems.

The Complainant, among many others, has provided the following trademark registrations:

- Sweden trademark for the term VOLVO (and design), Registration No. 33149, registered on November 29, 1927, in force until November 29, 2027; in International Classes (“ICs”) 7 and 12; and
- Sweden trademark for the term VOLVO (word mark), Registration No. 78133, registered on April 29, 1955, in force until April 29, 2035; in ICs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 25 and 27; and
- United States trademark for the term VOLVO (word mark), Registration No. 636129, registered on October 23, 1956, in force until April 23, 2027; in IC 12; and
- European Union Trade Mark for the term VOLVO (word mark), Registration No. 002347193, registered on January 28, 2003, in force until August 21, 2031; in ICs 35,36 and 39.

The VOLVO trademark is generally regarded as one of the world's most valuable brands according to various global rankings/surveys, e.g., the “Brand Finance Brand Directory,” which in 2024 ranked the VOLVO trademark as the world's 176th most valuable brand. The Volvo brand is also well-known in the United States, in which the Complainant was ranked as the 16th most popular car brand.

The Complainant's portfolio also includes a large number of domain names that incorporate the VOLVO mark, such as <volvo.com>, registered in 1995, which is the primary corporate and commercial domain name of the Complainant's company; also <volvocars.com>, <volvo.es> and <volvocars.es>.

On July 17, 2026, the Complainant sent a Trademark Infringement Notice to the Respondent via the Registrar. The Respondent did not provide any response.

The Panel notes that the reputation and well-known status of the VOLVO trademark have been recognized by previous panelists, such as in *Volvo Trademark Holding Aktiebolag v. Jeff Lander*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-2411](#); *Volvo Trademark Holding Aktiebolag v. Aleksandr Sheiko*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0355](#); *Volvo Trademark Holding Aktiebolag v. Domain Admin / Whois Privacy Corp.*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-1070](#).

The disputed domain name was registered on December 11, 2025. At the time this Complaint was filed, it resolved through redirection to one of the Complainant's active websites, i.e., <http://www.volvocars.com/es>. According to the redirect checker, the disputed domain name remains redirected to the Complainant's domain name <volvocars.com>, without authorization.

Following the Center's request for registrar verification, the underlying registrant information disclosed that the disputed domain name was registered in the name of "cars europa", apparently located in Germany.

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 confusingly similar to its well-known VOLVO trademark; that the additional term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Complainant's well-known trademark and the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, given that the disclosed Respondent does not correspond with the disputed domain name; that the Registrant information is most likely false, incorrect, or purposely misleading; that no license or authorization of any kind has been given by the Complainant to the Respondent to register or use the VOLVO trademark as a domain name or otherwise; that there is a considerable risk that the trade public will perceive the disputed domain name either as owned by the Complainant or that there is a relationship with the Complainant; that the Respondent has intentionally chosen the disputed domain name based on the Complainant's well-known trademark, and one of the Complainant's primary domain names <volvocars.com> to redirect all traffic for the disputed domain name to the website and URL of the Volvo Car Corporation in Spain, www.volvocars.com/es, without any authorization, which does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Lastly, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, given that, by the time of the disputed domain name's registration, the Complainant's trademark was widely known; additionally, the use given with traffic redirection shows, by itself, that the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant's VOLVO well-known trademark value, which constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (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.

In accordance with paragraph 5(f) of the Rules, in the absence of a Response, the Panel shall decide the dispute based upon the Complaint. The complainant bears the burden of proof; a respondent's default does not, by itself, mean that the complainant is deemed to have prevailed. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.3. Therefore, the Panel will decide this case based on the "balance of probabilities" or "preponderance of the evidence" standard. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.2.

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 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 entirety of the 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, a hyphen and the word "spain", 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 mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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.

It is well accepted that if the composition of a disputed domain name suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner, it cannot constitute fair use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Additionally, in this case, the unauthorized redirection of the disputed domain name to one of the main Complainant's domain names and websites, such as www.volvocars.com/es exploits the goodwill and reputation associated with the Complainant's VOLVO well-known trademark, while retaining control over a domain name capable of attracting Internet users who would reasonably believe that it was affiliated with or endorsed by the Complainant. Moreover, the Panel finds that by retaining control over the redirection, the Respondent could at any time redirect such users to an unauthorized or competing site, thereby creating a real or implied ongoing threat to the Complainant, which does not support a claim to rights or legitimate interests. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.3.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

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.

The Panel notes that by the time the disputed domain name was registered, the Complainant had already established its trademark rights, in this case for nearly a century, i.e., since 1927. The Complainant holds a large number of registrations for the trademark VOLVO across the world, including in the European Union. The composition and use of the disputed domain name clearly indicate that the Respondent was aware of and specifically targeted the Complainant's distinctive and well-known VOLVO trademark, and deliberately chose the disputed domain name with the Complainant in mind. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew the Complainant, and therefore the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

The Panel further notes that the Respondent has configured the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to one of the Complainant's websites. Such unauthorized redirection is relevant to the assessment of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. As noted in section 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), panels have found that redirecting a domain name to the complainant's website may constitute evidence of bad faith. Moreover, where the respondent retains control over the redirection, such conduct may create a real or implied ongoing threat to the complainant, as the respondent remains capable of redirecting the domain name to an unauthorized website or other online location. See *Holding Benjamin et Edmond de Rothschild, Pregny Société Anonyme v. ROTHSCHILD RAILWAYS CONSTRUCTION, Rothschild international Family foundation*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0869](#).

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 <volvo-spain.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/María Alejandra López García/

María Alejandra López García

Sole Panelist

Date: September 17, 2026