

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

AB Electrolux v. lee ming
Case No. D2026-3482

1. The Parties

The Complainant is AB Electrolux, Sweden, represented by Corsearch, Inc., United States of America ("U.S.").

The Respondent is lee ming, Malaysia, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <aktiebolaget-electrolux.com> is registered with Hello Internet Corp (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 6, 2026. On August 6, 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 (N/A) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 14, 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 19, 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 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 9, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on August 25, 2026. On September 11, 2026, the Center informed the Parties that it would proceed with panel appointment. On the same day, the Complainant's Supplemental Filing was received by the Center. On September 12, 2026, the Response was filed by the Respondent.

The Center appointed Rebecca Slater as the sole panelist in this matter on September 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

The Complainant is a Swedish multinational home appliance manufacturer headquartered in Stockholm, Sweden. The Complainant was founded in 1919 and is one of the world's leading appliance companies, selling products across more than 120 markets. "Aktiebolaget Electrolux" is the official, registered legal name of the Complainant. In 2025, the Complainant had sales of SEK 131 billion and employed 39,000 people worldwide.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trade mark registrations for the ELECTROLUX word mark and ELECTROLUX figurative mark in multiple jurisdictions, including: U.S. Registration No. 0248774 for the ELECTROLUX word mark (registered October 30, 1928); European Union ("EU") Registration No. 000077925 for the ELECTROLUX word mark (registered September 16, 1998); and International Registration No. 836605 for the ELECTROLUX figurative mark (registered March 17, 2004) (collectively, the "Trade Mark").

The Complainant operates its primary website at the domain name <electrolux.com> (registered April 30, 1996).

According to the Registrar's verification email, the Respondent is an individual, apparently located in Malaysia.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 27, 2026. The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website. Mail exchange ("MX") records have been set up for the disputed domain name, enabling the delivery of email communications.

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 the Trade Mark. The disputed domain name incorporates the Trade Mark in its entirety, prefixed by the word "aktiebolaget", which is the Swedish word for a limited company or joint-stock corporation and forms part of the Complainant's official registered legal name.
- The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to use the Trade Mark in a domain name or in any other capacity. The Respondent has used the disputed domain name to create unauthorized email addresses to impersonate the Complainant on the Shopee e-commerce platform, to register fraudulent Brand Owner accounts on the Shopee's Brand IP Portal, and to facilitate the sale of counterfeit goods through Shopee retail storefronts operating under the aliases "Vacuum & Cleaner" and "Preme Warehouse Store". Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services. The disputed domain name does not resolve to

an active website, and the passive holding of a domain name is neither a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

- The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name was registered significantly after the Complainant's earliest trade mark registration and the Complainant's registration of the domain name <electrolux.com>. Given the worldwide fame of the Complainant and the Trade Mark, and the fact that the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's official legal name, the Respondent must have had actual knowledge of the Complainant and the Trade Mark at the time of registration. The Respondent created the unauthorised email address "[...]"@aktiebolaget-electrolux.com" and used it to establish a deceptive Brand Owner account on Shopee, through which counterfeit goods were sold and forged authentication documents were submitted. The Respondent subsequently created a further unauthorised email address, "[...]"@aktiebolaget-electrolux.com", in connection with an additional fraudulent Brand Owner account associated with a separate retail storefront. MX records have been configured for the disputed domain name, creating an ongoing risk of email-based impersonation and fraud.

In its Supplemental Filing, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was used to create unauthorized email addresses that fraudulently obtained Brand Owner authorization on Shopee for the storefronts "Vacuum & Cleaner" and "Preme Warehouse Store". The misuse of the disputed domain name on the Shopee's Brand IP Portal constitutes bad faith regardless of any direct link between the seller accounts and the Brand Owner accounts.

B. Respondent

In the late Response, the Respondent acknowledges that the disputed domain name is registered in his name, and that email addresses using the disputed domain name were used for certain activities on the Shopee's Brand IP Portal.

However, the Respondent denies that he personally owned, operated, controlled, or benefited from the Shopee retail storefronts identified as "Vacuum & Cleaner" and "Preme Warehouse Store". The Respondent denies that he personally sold counterfeit Electrolux products through those storefronts or that he created, submitted, or used forged authorisation documents in connection with the alleged counterfeit sales.

The Respondent asks the Panel to distinguish between evidence concerning the disputed domain name and evidence concerning the identity and control of the separate Shopee retail accounts. The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not provided sufficient evidence to establish that the Respondent owned, operated, controlled, or benefited from the Shopee seller accounts, and that the existence or use of domain-based email addresses does not prove that the Respondent personally operated the retail storefronts.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Complainant's Unsolicited Supplemental Filing and Late Filing of the Response

On August 25, 2026, the Respondent submitted evidence that Shopee Customer Service had confirmed in writing that the email addresses associated with the disputed domain name ([...]"@aktiebolaget-electrolux.com) and the email address [...]"@gmail.com confirmed by the Registrar as the Respondent's email address were not registered in Shopee and were not linked to either the "Vacuum & Cleaner" or "Preme Warehouse Store" seller accounts. The Complainant's Supplemental Filing was made in direct response to this evidence. It argued that the Complainant had provided clear evidence establishing bad faith registration and use, included correspondence with Shopee regarding the investigation of the unauthorised email addresses, and noted that the "Preme Warehouse Store" account remained active with modified brand listings.

The Panel admits the Supplemental Filing because it responds to evidence submitted by the Respondent that the Complainant could not have anticipated at the time of filing the Complaint. Further, the record shows that the Complainant initially sent its Supplemental Filing to the Respondent on September 9, 2026, and forwarded to the Center on September 11, 2026. Therefore, the Respondent had received this Supplemental Filing prior to the filing of the Response on September 12, 2026. As discussed below, the Panel has admitted the late Response. It would be fair to also accept the Complainant's Supplemental Filing. Its admission does not cause delay and is consistent with the Panel's obligation under paragraph 10 of the Rules to ensure procedural fairness.

Under paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, a panel may, in its discretion, decide whether to consider a response that is filed late, to conduct the proceeding in a manner it considers appropriate, to ensure each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case, and to ensure that the proceeding takes place with due expedition. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.6.

The Panel admits the late Response for the following reasons:

- The Respondent is self-represented;
- The Respondent may expressly request an additional four calendar days in which to respond to the Complaint, and the Center will automatically grant such an extension pursuant to paragraph 5(b) of the Rules. Although the Respondent did not expressly request an extension, the Response was filed only three days after the due date;
- The Panel has admitted the Complainant's Supplemental Filing, which was sent to the Respondent on September 9, 2026;
- The Panel had not yet commenced its deliberations when the Response was received, and its admission has not required any extension of the proceedings; and
- The Response contains factual assertions relevant to the issues in dispute, and it is in the interest of reaching a just decision that the Panel has the benefit of both Parties' cases.

6.2. Substantive issues

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, namely:

- the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trade mark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The onus of proving these elements is on the Complainant.

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Trade Mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, “aktiebolaget” and a hyphen) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of this 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 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. Despite filing a Response, 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 Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its Trade Mark and there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further asserts that, while the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website, it has been used to create email addresses impersonating the Complainant, including for the purpose of establishing unauthorized Brand Owner accounts on Shopee’s Brand IP Portal. The Complaint also alleges that these accounts were used to support retail storefronts allegedly selling counterfeit ELECTROLUX-branded products, submit allegedly forged authorization documents, and challenge enforcement actions taken against those listings on the platform. While the Respondent denies any involvement in operating retail storefronts, selling counterfeit products, or forging documents, the Respondent acknowledges ownership of the disputed domain name and that email addresses associated with the disputed domain name were used for certain activities on Shopee’s Brand IP Portal. Further, the case record shows that the Complainant initially reported certain listings to Shopee as infringing, but that appeals relating to those listings were subsequently approved through email addresses associated with the disputed domain name. Such use of the disputed domain name does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

In addition, the Panel notes that the composition of the disputed domain name is inherently misleading and creates a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

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 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 finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith. The disputed domain name, which incorporates the Trade Mark in its entirety, was registered almost a century later after the Complainant acquired rights in the Trade Mark. In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent was more likely than not aware of the Complainant and targeted its Trade Mark when registering the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

The Respondent asked the Panel to distinguish between evidence concerning the disputed domain name and evidence concerning the identity and control of the Shopee retail accounts, contending that the Complainant has not provided sufficient evidence to establish that the Respondent personally owned, operated, controlled, or benefited from the "Vacuum & Cleaner" and "Preme Warehouse Store" seller accounts.

The Panel does not consider this contention to be material to its assessment of the third element of the Policy.

Under the Policy, it is the registration and use of the domain name that must be in bad faith. The question for the Panel is not the identity of the natural person who operated the Shopee retail accounts, but whether the disputed domain name has been registered and used in bad faith. The evidence before the Panel establishes that email addresses created under the disputed domain name were used to establish Brand Owner accounts on the Shopee's Brand IP Portal and, at a minimum, to approve appeals relating to listings reported by the Complainant as infringing. MX records were configured for the disputed domain name, enabling this email-based activity. The Respondent does not dispute that the disputed domain name is registered in his name, and he acknowledges that email addresses using the disputed domain name were used for certain activities on the Shopee platform.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity as discussed above constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <aktiebolaget-electrolux.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Rebecca Slater/

Rebecca Slater

Sole Panelist

Date: October 1, 2026