

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ABB Asea Brown Boveri Ltd. v. WOENG LTD, WOENG LTD
Case No. D2026-3359

1. The Parties

The Complainant is ABB Asea Brown Boveri Ltd., Switzerland, represented by Taylor Wessing Partnerschaftsgesellschaft mbB, Germany.

The Respondent is WOENG LTD, WOENG LTD, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <glb-abb.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 29, 2026. On July 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 30, 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 (Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 30, 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 30, 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 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 19, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Mihaela Maravela as the sole panelist in this matter on August 21, 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

According to information in the Complaint, the Complainant is part of the ABB Group, a worldwide leading group of companies, operating in particular in the field of power and automation technology with over 100,000 employees in over 100 countries worldwide. The Complainant's products and services include products from the areas of high, medium and low voltage, industrial automation (e.g. robotics) and comprehensive services in these areas. The Complainant has been featured in numerous rankings as one of the world's largest and highest-turnover corporations. Notably, in 2018, the Complainant was named among the top ten companies in Fortune magazine's "Change the World" list. In 2021, the Complainant was further ranked as the company with the second-highest turnover in the automation sector, generating USD 11.92 billion in revenue, and has been on the Global 500 list for 24 consecutive years.

The Complainant is the owner of several registered trademarks consisting of or including ABB, including the European Union Trademark registration No. 002628964 for ABB (figurative), registered on November 21, 2003, for classes 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 25, 26, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 45, or the United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK00902628964 for ABB (figurative), registered on November 21, 2003, for classes 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 16, 17, 19, 20, 25, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, and 45.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 10, 2026, and the Complainant has asserted that it redirected to the Complainant's official global website at "www.abb.com". At the date of the Decision, it does not resolve to an active website, the account being suspended.

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 includes the element "abb" which is identical to the Complainant's ABB trademarks. The additional element "glb" will be understood by Internet users as an abbreviation for "global" and thus merely describes that the website refers to ABB's global presence (including, in fact, a redirection to ABB's global website), resulting in a likelihood of confusion.

As regards the second element of the Policy, the Complainant contends that it has not authorized the Respondent to use the disputed domain name. Nor is the Respondent affiliated with it. The use of the disputed domain name to misrepresent that the Respondent is, or is officially connected with, the Complainant – including by redirecting to the Complainant's official global website – does not qualify as an offering of services in good faith for the purposes of the Policy.

With respect to the third element of the Policy, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has registered and is using a domain name that is highly similar to the Complainant's well-known ABB trademark. Both the registration of the disputed domain name and its specific use – including the redirection to the Complainant's official global website – are obviously intended to cause confusion among Internet users as to an association with the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to “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”. Likewise, paragraph 10(d) of the Rules, provides that “the Panel shall determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence”.

No response has been received from the Respondent in this case. Even if the Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's contentions, the Complainant still bears the burden of proving that all requirements are fulfilled. To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (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.

The applicable standard of proof in UDRP cases is the “balance of probabilities” or “preponderance of the evidence”, and the Panel can draw certain inferences in light of the particular facts and circumstances of the case. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 4.2. Concerning the uncontested information provided by the Complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the reasonable factual allegations in the Complaint as true. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.3.

The Panel has taken note of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views stated therein.

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 the trademark ABB 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, “glb”) and a hyphen may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such a term and a hyphen 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.

The Panel notes that the Respondent is not a licensee or an affiliate of the Complainant. The Complainant did not grant an authorization to the Respondent to make use of its ABB trademarks in any manner, including as part of the disputed domain name. Also, there is no evidence that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor does the Respondent appear to engage in any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraphs 4(c)(i) and (iii) of the Policy. Rather, according to the unrebutted allegations put forward by the Complainant, the disputed domain name was used to redirect to the Complainant’s official website. In the Panel’s view, such redirection of the disputed domain name is likely to confuse and mislead Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name is owned and controlled by the Complainant, which is not the case. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Complainant’s trademark.

The Respondent is named “WOENG LTD”, as was disclosed by the Registrar, and there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

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 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.

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.

According to the unrebutted assertions of the Complainant, its ABB trademarks were widely used in commerce well before the registration of the disputed domain name and are reputed. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar with the Complainant’s trademarks. Under these circumstances, the Panel considers that the Respondent has, more likely than not, registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark and that it targeted that trademark. This finding is further supported by the fact that the disputed domain name redirected to the Complainant’s official website.

The Panel also finds that the use as described above of the disputed domain name by the Respondent, which has no connection with the Complainant according to the records, to redirect users to the Complainant's official website, supports a finding of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Indeed, Panels have found that the lack of a respondent's own rights to or legitimate interests in a domain name, redirecting the domain name to the complainant's website, are circumstance supporting a finding that a respondent registered a domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the respondent's website or other online location by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark. Moreover, the Respondent retains control over the redirection of the disputed domain name, and is thus creating an implied ongoing threat to the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Further, the Respondent has not participated in this proceeding and has failed to rebut the Complainant's contentions and to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use.

The subsequent switch to a "Account suspended" notice does not, in the circumstances described above, change this finding, and the Panel finds that the current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not, in the circumstances of this case, prevent a finding of bad faith. There is no evidence in the record of a legitimate use of the disputed domain name. Also, the record in the present case shows that: (i) the trademark of the Complainant is distinctive and widely used in commerce, (ii) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, and (iii) the disputed domain name redirected to the Complainant's website and mislead Internet users before the disputed domain name led to an inactive page. In light of these specific circumstances, the Panel concludes that the Respondent's prior use of the disputed domain name satisfies the bad faith requirement of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, and that the current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not preclude such finding.

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 <glb-abb.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mihaela Maravela/

Mihaela Maravela

Sole Panelist

Date: August 26, 2026