

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

VDA Verband der Automobilindustrie e.V. v. riyadh adblue, Riyadh adblue
Case No. D2026-3396

1. The Parties

Complainant is VDA Verband der Automobilindustrie e.V., Germany, represented by Kroher Strobel Rechts- und Patentanwälte PartmbB, Germany.

Respondent is riyadh adblue, Riyadh adblue, Saudi Arabia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <riyadhadblue.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 31, 2026. On August 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 4, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on August 5, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on August 6, 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 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 Center informed the Parties that it would proceed to Panel Appointment on August 28, 2026. Respondent sent email communications to the Center on August 31, 2026, and September 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Lorelei Ritchie as the sole panelist in this matter on September 7, 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

Complainant is an interest group for the German automotive industry. In this capacity, Complainant owns a number of trademark registrations for the mark ADBLUE globally for a product that reduces the emissions of diesel engines. These registrations include, among others, Saudi Arabia Registration Nos. 142710640 (registered August 4, 2008) for AD BLUE and 143202260 (registered June 20, 2012), and International trademark registration No. 811899 (registered on August 8, 2003) for ADBLUE.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 1, 2025. Respondent has used the URL associated with the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that references Complainant's AD BLUE marks and which states, "RIYADH ADBLUE is a specialized supplier and distributor of ADBLUE". The website does not appear to include a disclaimer that would indicate a lack of affiliation or endorsement with Complainant.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks; (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Specifically, Complainant contends that it owns global rights to the "well-known" AD BLUE mark for 'urea that reduces the NOX emissions of diesel engines". Complainant contends that the disputed domain name incorporates-in-full Complainant's AD BLUE mark, with only the addition of the term, "riyadh", the capital city of Saudi Arabia where Complainant has several authorized licensees. Complainant contends that Respondent has no affiliation with Complainant and no authorization to use Complainant's AD BLUE mark.

Complainant asserts that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and rather has registered and is using it in bad faith, presumably for Respondent's own commercial gain, "by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's mark, as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website".

B. Respondent

Respondent sent email communications to the Center on August 31, 2026 and September 7, 2026, regarding requests to purchase rights to own or use Complainant's mark. Respondent did not expressly refute Complainant's contentions in this proceeding.

6. Discussion and Findings

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 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. Complainant has shown rights in respect of the ADBLUE mark which is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Although the addition of other terms

(here, “riyadh”) 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.

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 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 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.

Prior UDRP panels have indicated that a reseller may be considered to have rights or legitimate interests in a mark, provided certain requirements are met. These generally include that: (i) the site is actually offering the goods at issue; (ii) the site is used only to sell the trademarked goods; (iii) the site accurately and prominently discloses the registrant’s relationship to the mark holder; and (iv) the respondent does not try to “corner the market” in domain names that reflect the mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8; see also *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#).

The Panel finds that these qualifications are not fulfilled by the website associated with the disputed domain name. The associated website does not appear to include a disclaimer that would indicate a lack of affiliation or endorsement by Complainant, and rather includes unauthorized display of Complainant’s ADBLUE marks. Respondent has not put forward any claims or evidence that would suggest rights or legitimate interests for the purposes of the Policy.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

There are several ways that a complainant can demonstrate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith. As noted in Section 4 of this Panel’s Decision, the record includes evidence that Respondent has used the URL associated with the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that references Complainant’s AD BLUE marks and which states, “RIYADH ADBLUE is a specialized supplier and distributor of ADBLUE”. The website does not appear to include any disclaimer of affiliation (or lack thereof) with Complainant.

The Panel thus finds sufficient evidence that Respondent was aware of Complainant’s rights and Complainant’s marks at the time of registering the disputed domain name and intended to target them. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

The Panel further finds that Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name for a commercial website purportedly offering goods associated with Complainant’s ADBLUE marks, without accurately and prominently disclosing the lack of affiliation with Complainant, creates a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website. The Panel therefore finds that Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel finds 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 <riyadhadblue.com> be cancelled.

/Lorelei Ritchie/

Lorelei Ritchie

Sole Panelist

Date: September 21, 2026