

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Maurten AB v. Vogt Janina, 黄保传 (bao chuan huang), Frank Schroeder, huang baochuan, Finkel Andreas, Andreas Finkel
Case No. D2026-3821

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Maurten AB, Sweden, represented by Zacco Sweden AB, Sweden.

The Respondents are Vogt Janina, Germany, 黄保传 (bao chuan huang), China, Frank Schroeder, Germany, huang baochuan, China, and Finkel Andreas, Andreas Finkel, Germany.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <maurtenaustralia.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC. The disputed domain names <maurtenbelgie.com> and <maurtensouthafrica.com> are registered with Xiamen 35.Com Information Co., Ltd. The disputed domain names <maurtendeutschland.com> and <maurtenespana.com> are registered with Guizhou Zhongyu Zhike Network Technology Co., Ltd. The disputed domain names <maurtenfrance.com>, <maurtengelnz.com>, <maurtenitalia.com>, and <maurtennederland.com> are registered with Cloud Yuqu LLC. The disputed domain name <maurtenireland.com> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com. The disputed domain names <maurtennorge.com> and <maurtensverige.com> are registered with Bangning Digital Technology Co., Ltd. The disputed domain name <maurtenuk.com> is registered with CNOBIN Information Technology Limited. The disputed domain name <maurten-usa.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc. NameSilo, LLC, Xiamen 35.Com Information Co., Ltd., Guizhou Zhongyu Zhike Network Technology Co., Ltd., Cloud Yuqu LLC, PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com, Bangning Digital Technology Co., Ltd, CNOBIN Information Technology Limited, and Dynadot Inc are separately and collectively referred to below as the “Registrar”.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 26, 2026. On August 26, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. Between August 26, 2026 and September 1, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Privacy User #a8575d00/ Registration Private/ Dynadot Privacy Service) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 1, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar(s), requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint in English on September 3, 2026, and an amended Complaint in English on September 4, 2026.

On September 1, 2026, the Center informed the parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On September 3, 2026, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondents did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint and 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 Respondents in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 24, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on September 25, 2026.

The Center appointed Joseph Simone as the sole panelist in this matter on September 29, 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, Maurten AB, is a Swedish company founded in 2015, known as an innovator within sports fuel. Maurten's patented technology provides energy to working muscles through natural and easily tolerated sports fuels, and their products are today used by some of the world's best athletes and marathoners.

The Complainant has the following trade mark registrations for MAURTEN, namely:

- European Union trade mark Registration No. 018787866 for MAURTEN in Classes 9, 21, 30, 35, 41, 45, registered on March 6, 2023;
- International trade mark Registration No. 1401151 for MAURTEN in Classes 5, 25, 32, registered on November 19, 2017, designating inter alia Australia, China, European Union, Japan, New Zealand, United Arab Emirates and United States of America; and
- International trade mark Registration No. 1733568 for MAURTEN in Classes 9, 21, 30, 35, 41, 45, registered on April 6, 2023, designating inter alia Australia, China, Japan, New Zealand, United Arab Emirates and United States of America.

The disputed domain names were registered on the following dates:

- <maurten-usa.com> on June 9, 2026;
- <maurtenaustralia.com> on June 8, 2026;
- <maurtenbelgie.com> on June 9, 2026;
- <maurtendeutschland.com> on June 9, 2026;
- <maurtenespana.com> on June 9, 2026;

<maurtenfrance.com> on June 9, 2026;
<maurtengelnz.com> on June 9, 2026;
<maurtenireland.com> on June 9, 2026;
<maurtenitalia.com> on June 9, 2026;
<maurtennederland.com> on June 9, 2026;
<maurtennorge.com> on June 9, 2026;
<maurtensouthafrica.com> on June 9, 2026;
<maurtensverige.com> on June 9, 2026; and
<maurtenuk.com> on June 9, 2026.

The Complainant has submitted evidence showing that the disputed domain names resolved to websites prominently displaying the Complainant's trademark and logo, purportedly offering the Complainant's products, with the intent to impersonate the Complainant.

At the time of this Decision, all the disputed domain names resolve to error pages.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names registered by the Respondents are confusingly similar to the Complainant's MAURTEN mark, and that the addition of descriptive word such as "gel" and/or geographical terms does not help to distinguish the source of the goods.

The Complainant asserts that it has not authorized the Respondents to use the MAURTEN mark, and there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondents have used, or have undertaken any demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant also claims that there is no evidence that the Respondents have any connection to the MAURTEN mark, and that there is no plausible good faith reason for the Respondents to have registered the disputed domain names. The Complainant therefore argues that the registration and any use of the disputed domain names must be in bad faith.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issues

A. Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreements for the disputed domain names is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceedings shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceedings be English for several reasons, including the facts that:

- The disputed domain names consist of a trademark in Latin characters and are hosting websites which are entirely in English, or in the language corresponding to the geographical term incorporated in the respective domain name;
- The Respondents have registered some of the disputed domain names through registrars where the Registration Agreement(s) are in English;
- The Complainant contends that it would be unfairly disadvantaged and the proceedings would be unduly delayed if it were required to translate all the submissions into Chinese at substantial expenses; and
- The Respondents did not make any specific submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

B. Consolidation of Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

Paragraph 10(e) of the Rules states that a "[p]anel shall decide a request by a Party to consolidate multiple domain name disputes in accordance with the Policy and these Rules". Paragraph 10(c) of the Rules provides, in relevant part, that "the [p]anel shall ensure that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition". Section 4.11.2 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) summarizes the consensus view of UDRP panels on the consolidation of multiple respondents and provides that where a complaint is filed against multiple respondents, panels consider whether the domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control, and whether the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties.

The record indicates the disputed domain names are under common control. The Complainant has submitted substantial evidence to support such assertion, including the following:

- All of the disputed domain names: (1) incorporate the Complainant's MAURTEN marks; (2) incorporate geographic and/or descriptive terms to give the disputed domain names an appearance of a geographically specific source for the Complainant's products; (3) were registered on June 8, 2026 or June 9, 2026; (4) are using one same hosting provider, i.e., Angelnet Limited, to host the websites; and (5) share registrant information in common.
- The Respondents direct all the disputed domain names to websites of the same design to impersonate the Complainant by prominently displaying the official MAURTEN branding and purportedly offering the Complainant's products.
- The Respondents have not presented any arguments as to why consolidation would be unfair or inequitable.

Accordingly, conditions for proper consolidation of the disputed domain names under one complaint are present here.

6.2 Substantive Issues

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 Panel acknowledges that the Complainant has established rights in the MAURTEN trade marks. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

Here, the MAURTEN mark is fully incorporated and clearly visible in each of the disputed domain names. The addition of other descriptive term such as "gel" and geographic terms such as "usa", "australia", "belgie", "deutschland", "espana", "france", "nz" (which is most commonly interpreted as "New Zealand"), "ireland", "italia", "nederland", "norge", "southafrica", "sverige" and "uk" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the MAURTEN mark for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy in establishing its rights in the MAURTEN trade mark and in showing that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its mark.

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.

In this case, the Complainant asserts that it has not authorized the Respondents to use its trade marks and there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondents have used, or undertaken any demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondents lack rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

The Respondents did not file a response and have therefore failed to assert factors or put forth evidence to establish that they enjoy rights or other legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

According to the Complainant, the Respondents are not affiliated or connected with the Complainant in any manner, and the Complainant has not granted the Respondents any license or authorization to use or register a domain name incorporating the Complainant's MAURTEN trade marks. The Respondents did not respond to the Complaint and did not provide any information or factors that could potentially establish prior rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. Furthermore, there is no evidence indicating that the Respondents have engaged in any legitimate noncommercial or bona fide use of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant has presented evidence linking the disputed domain names to websites imitating the Complainant, which supports a finding that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

The Panel notes that the websites to which the disputed domain names resolved displayed the Complainant's MAURTEN mark. The Complainant also claims that the Respondents have used the Complainant's product images on the websites, to which the Respondents have not objected. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for impersonation can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Accordingly, based on the Panel's findings, the Panel finds that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The third and final element that a complainant must prove is that the respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy states that any of the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, shall be considered as evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith:

- (i) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant (the owner of the trade mark or service mark) or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trade mark 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) circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) circumstances indicating that the respondent is using the domain name to intentionally attempt 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 its website or location.

The examples of bad faith registration and use set forth in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy are not meant to be exhaustive of all circumstances in which bad faith may be found. Other circumstances may also 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.

For reasons discussed under this and the preceding heading, the Panel believes that the Respondents' conduct in this case constitutes bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain names. The Respondents registered the disputed domain names incorporating the entirety of the Complainant's MAURTEN mark, a mark that has been in continuous and extensive use for years before the disputed domain names are registered and enjoys a high degree of distinctiveness and recognition in the sports fuel market. There is no plausible explanation for the Respondents' choice to register the disputed domain names built around the MAURTEN mark other than to trade off the Complainant's goodwill and reputation. The Respondents knew, or should have known, of the Complainant's well-established rights in the MAURTEN mark at the time of registration. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

Moreover, the Respondents have used the disputed domain names to operate imposter websites featuring the Complainant's branding, logos, color scheme, and images to create a false impression of affiliation with or endorsement by the Complainant. This conduct falls squarely within the bad faith scenario described in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Respondents have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to their websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's MAURTEN mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of those websites. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

The Respondents' failure to submit a response to the Complaint further supports the above conclusion, as it leaves unrebutted the Complainant's well-supported contentions and permits the Panel to draw appropriate inferences. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.3.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondents have registered and used the disputed domain names 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 names <maurtenaustralia.com>, <maurtenbelgie.com>, <maurtendeutschland.com>, <maurtenespana.com>, <maurtenfrance.com>, <maurtengelnz.com>, <maurtenireland.com>, <maurtenitalia.com>, <maurtennederland.com>, <maurtennorge.com>, <maurtensouthafrica.com>, <maurtensverige.com>, <maurtenuk.com>, and <maurten-usa.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Joseph Simone/

Joseph Simone

Sole Panelist

Date: October 13, 2026