

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Archer-Daniels-Midland Company v. Archer Daniels Midlands Case No. D2026-3464

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Archer-Daniels-Midland Company, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Innis Law Group LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Archer Daniels Midlands, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <admnutrie.com> is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 4, 2026. On August 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 7, 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 (Domain Protection Services, Inc.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 11, 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 August 14, 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 August 17, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 6, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 7, 2026. On September 24, 2026, the Respondent sent an email communication to the Center.

The Center appointed Andrew J. Park as the sole panelist in this matter on September 10, 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, Archer-Daniels-Midland Company (“ADM”), is an American multinational agricultural origination, processing, and nutrition company founded in 1902 and headquartered in Chicago, Illinois, United States. The Complainant operates a global agricultural supply chain and processing network and provides products and solutions for human and animal nutrition, food and beverages, health and wellness, and industrial applications. The Complainant’s business activities extend beyond its traditional agricultural operations to include printing and publishing; financial and business management services; fuel production and logistics services, including agricultural storage and transportation; and research and development services. In connection with these business activities, the Complainant provides online access to commodity trading platforms and related market information. Through its global operations and extensive business network, the Complainant serves customers across six continents and operates its official website at <adm.com>.

The Complainant was originally established as Daniels Linseed Co. in 1902 and changed its name to Archer-Daniels-Midland Company in 1923. The Complainant has used the name ADM in connection with its business for many decades and has developed a substantial international presence under the ADM name and trademark. The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for the ADM mark worldwide, including multiple United States federal trademark registrations. The ADM mark has been used in connection with the Complainant’s extensive range of agricultural, food, nutrition, and related products and services for many decades. As a result of the Complainant’s longstanding and extensive use, the ADM mark has become widely recognized in connection with the Complainant and its business.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for ADM, including the following US registrations:

Trademark	Serial No.	Reg. No.	Applin Date	Reg. Date
ADM	73531611	1,386,430	April 11, 1985	March 18, 1986
ADM	75561562	2,301,968	September 29, 1998	December 21, 1999
ADM	75595542	2,307,492	November 25, 1998	January 11, 2000
ADM	75725901	2,430,864	June 10, 1999	February 27, 2001
ADM	76462801	2,766,613	October 25, 2002	September 23, 2003
E-ADM	78952533	3,344,263	August 15, 2006	November 27, 2007

The disputed domain name <admnutrie.com> was registered on May 28, 2026. The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website but has been used for email communications impersonating representatives of the Complainant. Following verification with the Registrar, the registration information for the disputed domain name was disclosed as “Archer Daniels Midlands,” using the address of the Complainant’s North American headquarters and an email address associated with prior domain name registrations involving variations of the Complainant’s corporate name. Those domain names were the subject of prior proceedings before the Center and were subsequently transferred to the Complainant.

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.

(1) Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant asserts that it owns hundreds of ADM trademark registrations in numerous jurisdictions worldwide. These trademarks were adopted and have been continuously used since at least as early as 1923 in connection with numerous products and services. Today, the ADM marks are largely recognizable due to the international nature of the Complainant's business, as well as the online presence that the Complainant maintains. The Complainant owns the domain name, which resolves to its official website at <adm.com> and allows the Complainant's customers to conduct business with the Complainant from anywhere in the world.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name, <admnutrie.com>, is confusingly similar to the ADM mark because it incorporates the mark in its entirety. The Complainant further asserts that the addition of "nutrie" does not distinguish the disputed domain name from the ADM mark; rather, it reinforces an association with the Complainant, given ADM's established nutrition business and its ADM Animal Nutrition division.

Finally, the Complainant submits that the clear visual, phonetic, and conceptual similarities between the ADM mark and <admnutrie.com> render the disputed domain name confusingly similar to the Complainant's ADM trademark.

(2) Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the name "admnutrie.com," which was registered on May 28, 2026, and promptly used in connection with a fraudulent scheme impersonating an ADM sales representative. The Complainant asserts that such use cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, particularly where the domain name is used to deceive individuals and businesses into believing that they are communicating with an ADM representative and to facilitate fraudulent transactions. The Complainant further notes that the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website and has not been used, nor prepared for use, in connection with any legitimate offering of goods or services.

In sum, the Complainant submits that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name constitutes a prima facie showing of the absence of rights or legitimate interests and therefore the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

(3) Registered and Used in Bad faith

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith to impersonate ADM and facilitate fraudulent business transactions. The Respondent has used the ADM name and mark, together with the disputed domain name and the associated email address, "[...]@admnutrie.com", to create the false impression that communications originated from an ADM representative and to solicit purported purchases of ADM goods. The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent's use of ADM's name, addresses, websites, and other identifying information demonstrates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its rights in the ADM mark when registering the disputed domain name. The Complainant characterizes this conduct as fraudulent and asserts that it may give rise to violations of applicable civil and criminal laws. The Complainant also points to the Respondent's use of similar names and other domain names incorporating "ADM" and references to "nutrition," as well as prior WIPO decisions involving similar schemes to impersonate ADM representatives and solicit fraudulent transactions.

On this basis, the Complainant submits that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name <admnutrie.com> as an initial step in a scheme to commit fraud. These actions clearly indicate the Respondent's intentional and bad faith attempt to create a likelihood of confusion with ADM's famous ADM marks and to trade off the goodwill associated with its ADM marks and <adm.com>. Therefore, the disputed domain name <admnutrie.com> should be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions, but only sent an email communication on September 24, 2026.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

This element consists of two parts: first, whether the Complainant has rights in a relevant trademark and, second, whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to that trademark.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established registered rights in the ADM trademark, which substantially predates the registration of the disputed domain name in 2026.

The disputed domain name incorporates the ADM mark in its entirety. The addition of the term "nutrie" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's ADM trademark. Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the incorporation of the ADM mark in its entirety into the disputed domain name is sufficient to establish confusing similarity. Also, in determining whether a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark, the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") is typically disregarded for purposes of comparison (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.11.1).

For these reasons, pursuant to the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i), the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark and that the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, the Complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Once such a prima facie case is made, the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating its rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. If the Respondent fails to do so, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, the Respondent may establish its rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, among other circumstances, by showing any of the following elements:

- (i) before any notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) the Respondent (as an individual, business, or other organization) has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, even if it has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

Here, having reviewed the available records, the Panel finds that 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 failed to provide any evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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 Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its ADM trademark, and there is no evidence of any relationship between the Parties that would give rise to any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and on the part of the Respondent. Furthermore, the Respondent has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor has it made a bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's ADM trademark in its entirety, with the addition of the descriptive term "nutrie" which evokes the meaning of "nutrition." Such composition creates an apparent association with the Complainant's business activities rather than indicating any legitimate interest of the Respondent. Moreover, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to create an email address associated with the disputed domain name and send fraudulent communications impersonating the Complainant constitutes compelling evidence that the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Such deceptive use for phishing and impersonation purposes cannot establish rights or legitimate interests under the Policy.

The disputed domain name also does not resolve to an actual website. There is no evidence that the Respondent has used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or for a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

In the absence of any response from the Respondent and any credible evidence to the contrary, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Panel holds that the Complainant has established an un rebutted prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy and has therefore established the second element of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides a non-exclusive list of circumstances that evidence registration and use of a domain name in bad faith. Any one of the following is sufficient to support a finding of bad faith:

(i) circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark, or to a competitor of that the complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) the respondent has registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) the respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the respondent's website or location or of a product or service on the respondent's website or location.

The Complainant claims that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. In particular, the Complainant contends that the Respondent's conduct falls squarely within the scope of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, as the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in an attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent deliberately targeted the ADM trademark by registering a disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant's mark and using it to impersonate the Complainant in connection with purported purchases of ADM goods.

As stated previously, the Respondent did not file any response to the Complaint and therefore failed to rebut the Complainant's allegations concerning the Respondent's bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name. Nevertheless, the Panel remains responsible for determining whether the evidence establishes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with actual knowledge of the Complainant's ADM trademark and used the disputed domain name to exploit the reputation and goodwill associated with the Complainant's mark. The Complainant's rights in the ADM trademark substantially predate the registration of the disputed domain name, and the ADM mark has achieved extensive international recognition through longstanding use in connection with the Complainant's businesses. Moreover, the incorporation of the ADM mark in the disputed domain name, combined with the term "nutrie," which is suggestive of nutrition and corresponds to an established area of the Complainant's business, demonstrates that the Respondent intentionally targeted the Complainant's trademark and created an apparent affiliation with the Complainant.

The evidence further demonstrates that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to carry out a fraudulent impersonation scheme involving purported transactions for ADM goods. The Respondent created an email address associated with the disputed domain name and used it to send deceptive business communications, falsely suggesting that such communications originated from or were authorized by the Complainant. The Respondent also used the Complainant's name, business addresses, and websites in such communications, thereby creating an appearance of legitimacy. By leveraging the trust and recognition associated with the ADM brand, the Respondent intentionally sought to attract Internet users through a misleading appearance of affiliation with the Complainant.

The Respondent's repeated use of the Complainant's identity and established business presence in this manner demonstrates an intentional effort to deceive third parties and obtain an improper benefit by exploiting the reputation and credibility associated with the ADM name and trademark. Such conduct constitutes bad faith use under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, as the Respondent attempted to obtain an improper commercial benefit through a scheme designed to induce third parties to enter into purported transactions for ADM goods based on the Respondent's false association with the Complainant.

The Complainant has also presented evidence that the Respondent's conduct bears similarities to a previous scheme involving another domain name registration and the use of ADM-related names and domain names, including references to "nutrition." The Complainant has also referred to prior WIPO decisions involving similar schemes to impersonate ADM representatives and solicit fraudulent transactions. These circumstances provide additional context supporting the conclusion that the disputed domain name was not registered for any legitimate purpose, but formed part of a deliberate scheme to misuse the Complainant's brand identity and deceive the internet users.

The Respondent has provided no explanation or evidence to justify its registration and use of the disputed domain name and has remained silent throughout these proceedings. Considering the totality of the circumstances, including the fame of the ADM trademark, the deliberate incorporation of the mark into the disputed domain name, and the Respondent's subsequent fraudulent use of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name as a means to impersonate the Complainant and exploit the goodwill associated with its trademark.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Respondent's conduct falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy and that the third element of the Policy has been established. The Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <admnutrie.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrew J. Park/

Andrew J. Park

Sole Panelist

Date: September 24, 2026