

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Swedish Match North Europe AB, Philip Morris International, Inc., Nyz AB v.
Karakut Ricketts, NYZ AB
Case No. D2026-4008

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Swedish Match North Europe AB, Sweden, Philip Morris International, Inc., United States of America, and Nyz AB, Sweden, represented by Akran Intellectual Property, Italy.

The Respondent is Karakut Ricketts, NYZ AB, Sweden.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <nyzab.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 7, 2026. On September 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 9, 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, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on September 10, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint on September 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 September 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrew F. Christie as the sole panelist in this matter on October 9, 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 first Complainant in this administrative proceeding is Swedish Match North Europe AB (the “First Complainant”), a company established under the laws of Sweden. The third Complainant in this administrative proceeding is Nyz AB (the “Third Complainant”), a company established under the laws of Sweden. Both the First Complainant and the Third Complainant are wholly-owned subsidiaries of the Swedish company Swedish Match AB (“Swedish Match”). Swedish Match is primarily engaged in the business of manufacturing, marketing and selling smoke free tobacco products, such as snus and nicotine pouches, which are sold in several countries. The Third Complainant operates as a dedicated patent-holding entity for Swedish Match’s oral nicotine delivery technology. The second Complainant in this administrative proceeding is Philip Morris International, Inc. (the “Second Complainant”), a company established under the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia, United States of America. The Second Complainant is the parent company of Swedish Match. The First Complainant, the Second Complainant and the Third Complainant are collectively referred to herein as the “Complainant”.

The Complainant is an international leader in smoke-free oral nicotine products. One of the Complainant’s flagship brands is ZYN, which was first launched in 2016 and represents a market-leading position globally. The First Complainant owns a large number of trademark registrations for the word trademark ZYN, including European Union Trade Mark No. 015272487 (registered on July 8, 2016) and International Trademark No. 1456681 (registered December 27, 2018) designating a large number of jurisdictions. Another wholly-owned subsidiary of Swedish Match, Pinkerton Tobacco Co. LP, is the owner of United States Trademark No. 5061008 (registered October 11, 2016) for the word trademark ZYN.

On August 12, 2026, unauthorized 3D printing equipment was delivered to Swedish Match’s premises in Stockholm, Sweden, with shipping documentation falsely listing the Third Complainant as the recipient and citing fictitious contact details. On August 13, 2026, Swedish Match filed a formal criminal report with the Stockholm Police Department regarding corporate identity hijacking, confirming that an unknown perpetrator had unlawfully impersonated company executives, fabricated digital signatures and corporate credentials, and placed fraudulent orders valued at approximately SEK 500,000. Investigations and police filings revealed further unauthorized corporate orders attempted with third-party vendors, including computer equipment valued at approximately SEK 700,000, abusing the Third Complainant’s corporate identity under the pretext of deferred invoice billing. This fraudulent scheme operated via the domain name <nzyb.se>, which was disabled on August 18, 2026, following takedown notifications sent to the hosting registrar.

On the same day that the domain name <nzyb.se> was disabled, the disputed domain name was registered. The Complainant provided undated screenshots of the pages of the website to which the disputed domain name resolved. The website purported to be a website of the Third Complainant. It contained numerous references to the Third Complainant’s name, and provided the Third Complainant’s company registration number, registered office address, and corporate timeline. It also contained detailed technical summaries of the Third Complainant’s proprietary nicotine pouch patents.

As at the date of this decision, the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active location.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the Complaint may be brought jointly in the names of the First Complainant, the Second Complainant and the Third Complainant on the following grounds. Multiple complainants may jointly file a single complaint where they share a common legal interest in a relevant trademark or corporate identity, and where the target of the respondent's conduct affects the group as a single economic unit. In this case, the First Complainant, the Second Complainant and the Third Complainant share full corporate integration, common economic interests, and a unified intellectual property enforcement posture against the Respondent's targeted identity theft and cybersquatting scheme.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which it has rights on the following grounds. A domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark, when the domain name includes the trademark, or a confusingly similar approximation or deliberate anagram/reversal thereof. The disputed domain name wholly incorporates the term "nyz" combined with the corporate suffix "ab". The prominent textual element "nyz" is the exact mirror reversal and anagram of the Complainant's coined, arbitrary, and well-known trademark ZYN. The addition of the designation "ab" (which, when capitalized, is the standard Swedish statutory abbreviation for Aktiebolag, or limited liability company) does not diminish the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark; on the contrary, it directly and identically reproduces the corporate name of the Third Complainant, which is Swedish Match's wholly-owned patent-holding entity. The intentional reference to both the reversed ZYN mark and the exact trade name of the Complainant's intellectual property holding entity confirms that the disputed domain name was specifically constructed to target the Complainant. Any Internet user when visiting a website provided under the disputed domain name will reasonably expect to find a website commercially linked to the owner of the ZYN trademark, and to its corporate affiliate, the Third Complainant, particularly given that the resolving website reproduces authentic corporate details and patent references of the Third Complainant.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name on the following grounds. The Complainant has never licensed, authorized, or permitted the Respondent to use the ZYN trademark or to represent the Third Complainant or Swedish Match. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name; rather, the Respondent falsely assumed the corporate personification of the Third Complainant to cloak illicit procurement operations in apparent legitimacy. The use of a domain name for illegal activity, impersonation, phishing, or fraudulent commercial procurement can never confer rights or legitimate interests upon a respondent. The spoofing of the Third Complainant's corporate details and patent portfolio to establish false commercial credibility establishes the complete absence of rights or legitimate interests. Such use of the disputed domain name cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods and does not establish a legitimate interest on behalf of the Respondent.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith on the following grounds. The evidence confirms that the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant, the ZYN trademark, and the Third Complainant's proprietary patent portfolio at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. This bad faith awareness is incontrovertibly established by the disclosed registrant data itself, wherein the Respondent falsely declared its organization as "NYZ AB" and provided the Third Complainant's real office address. The Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name intentionally to deceive the public and third-party vendors by creating an illegitimate website that mimics the Third Complainant's official corporate presence. This deception was designed to facilitate fraudulent procurement schemes (as demonstrated by the unauthorized 3D printer and IT equipment orders) and to disrupt the Complainant's business, which constitutes bad faith per se. The registration of the disputed domain name occurred on the exact date that the predecessor infringing domain name <nyzab.se> was taken down by its registrar, evidencing a calculated, continuous effort to target the Complainant. The Respondent concealed its identity behind a commercial privacy shield and misappropriated the Third Complainant's address and company name, utilizing a generic email address for execution, which reinforces the finding of bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Filing of Complaint by Multiple Complainants

As explained in section 1.4.1 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), a trademark owner's affiliate, such as a subsidiary of a parent or holding company, is considered to have rights in a trademark under the Policy for the purposes of standing to file a complaint. The same holds true for a parent company filing a UDRP case on the basis of rights held in the name of one of the companies or brands under its corporate umbrella.

In this case, the Second Complainant is the parent company of Swedish Match, which is the parent company of the First Complainant and the Third Complainant. The Second Complainant is thus the ultimate owner of the First Complainant and the Third Complainant. Further, the First Complainant, the Second Complainant and the Third Complainant operate as a corporate group in the provision of smoke-free oral nicotine products. In these circumstances, it is appropriate to treat each of them as having rights in the trademarks owned by the others. Accordingly, the Panel is satisfied that each of the First Complainant, the Second Complainant and the Third Complainant has standing to bring this Complaint.

B. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. It is the owner of a trademark registration for the word trademark ZYN.

As explained in section 1.7 of [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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. However, a panel may find that the broader case context, such as website content or fraudulent (phishing) emails trading off the complainant's reputation, supports a finding of confusing similarity with the complainant's mark.

The entirety of the letters comprising the Complainant's word trademark ZYN is reproduced within the disputed domain name, in mirror order, followed by the letters "ab". Without more, it would not be straightforward to conclude that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. However, there is much more in this case. In particular, there are the circumstances that: (i) the disputed domain name was registered on the same day that the equivalent domain name in the ".se" country-code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") was taken down by its registrar following its use in an attempted fraudulent impersonation of the Third Complainant; (ii) the disputed domain name was used to resolve to a website which sought to impersonate the Third Complainant; (iii) the disputed domain name consists of the full corporate name of the Third Complainant; and (iv) the disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent adopting as the organization name and registrant address the Third Complainant's name and address.

Courts in trademark and unfair competition law cases have adopted the logic that if a defendant intended to cause consumer confusion, it can be presumed that they succeeded. That logic can be applied to cases under the UDRP. When the specific circumstances listed above are considered, it is clear that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name as part of a plan to impersonate the Third Complainant and thereby to confuse Internet users into believing that the Respondent was associated with the Complainant and its trademark. The Panel is satisfied that the disputed domain name, which contains the mirror of the Complainant's trademark, is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

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

C. 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.

The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, is not otherwise affiliated with the Complainant, and has not been authorized by the Complainant to use its ZYN trademark. The Respondent has not provided any evidence that it has been commonly known by, or has made a bona fide use of, the disputed domain name, or that it has, for any other reason, rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Third Complainant. The disputed domain name resolved to a website that seeks to impersonate the Third Complainant. The Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name in this way unfairly took advantage of the Third Complainant’s name for the Respondent’s benefit. Such use of the disputed domain name is not a bona fide offering of goods or services, and is not a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Accordingly, such use does not confer on the Respondent rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has put forward a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and the Respondent has not rebutted this. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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

D. 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.

In the present case, the Panel treats as significant the fact that: (i) the Respondent registered the disputed domain name more than a decade after the Complainant first registered its ZYN trademark; (ii) the disputed domain name was registered on the same day that the “.se” ccTLD equivalent domain name was taken down by its registrar, following its use in an attempted fraud on the Complainant; (iii) the disputed domain name was used to resolve to a website which sought to impersonate the Third Complainant; (iv) the disputed domain name consists of the full corporate name of the Third Complainant; (v) when registering the disputed domain name, the Respondent provided the Third Complainant’s name and address as the organization name and registrant address; and (vi) the Respondent did not seek to dispute any of the Complainant’s assertions. It seems clear that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Third Complainant and the Complainant’s trademark.

The evidence shows that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in an intentional attempt to attract, apparently for commercial gain, Internet users to a website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Third Complainant and the Complainant’s trademark.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute 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 <nyzab.com> be transferred to the Complainant (with the particular company to be identified by the Complainant).

/Andrew F. Christie/

Andrew F. Christie

Sole Panelist

Date: October 10, 2026