ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
FlexLink AB v. Geraldo zilli, Vibrating Equipment Limited
Case No. D2026-4209

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Geraldo zilli, Vibrating Equipment Limited, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <flexlinkscompactspiral.com>, <flexlinkspiral.com>, and <flexlinkspiralconveyor.com> are 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 18, 2026. On September 21, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On September 23, 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 (Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 23, 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 amendment to the Complaint on September 23, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 25, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 15, 2026. The Respondent requested the automatic four calendar day extension of the deadline for submitting the Response. On September 30, 2026, the Center sent an email communication to the Parties notifying the extension of the due date for Response to October 19, 2026. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on September 24, 2026, September 25, 2026, September 30, 2026, October 1, 2026, and October 2, 2026.

The Center appointed Áron László as the sole panelist in this matter on October 27, 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, FlexLink AB, is a Swedish multinational company founded in Göteborg in 1980. It is a subsidiary of FlexLink Holding AB and is owned by Coesia Group, a group of companies specialised in innovative industrial and packaging solutions, headquartered in Bologna, Italy. Coesia Group employs more than 8,000 people across 34 countries and 83 production plants worldwide, and had a recorded total revenue of approximately EUR 2,120 million in 2025.

The Complainant manufactures automated production and material flow solutions, providing its global customer base with automated conveyor systems, conveyor equipment, and aluminium and stainless steel conveyors. The Complainant is also a complete solution provider for automated production flows, including conveyor design, custom conveyor engineering, and software and support to manage information flows in a production process. The Complainant's products and solutions are sold to professional users in more than 60 countries, with sales amounting to nearly SEK 4,200 million in 2024. The group has approximately 1,300 employees across four continents.

The Complainant is the owner of the trademark FLEXLINK. The Complainant's trademark registrations include, inter alia:

- United States trademark registration No. 1348931 for the word mark FLEXLINK registered on July 16, 1985;
- European Union trademark registration No. 001941137 for the word mark FLEXLINK registered on December 20, 2002;
- United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK00901941137 for the word mark FLEXLINK registered on December 20, 2002.

The Complainant owns several domain names incorporating its FLEXLINK trademark, including <flexlink.com>, registered in 1997, <flexlink.co.uk>, registered in 1996, and <flexlink.uk>, registered in 2014.

The reputation and value of the FLEXLINK trademark have been recognised in previous decisions under the Policy, including in (*FlexLink AB v. Shang Hai Shang Qian Shi Ye You Xian Gong Si,* WIPO Case No. DCC2024-0036), concerning the domain name <flexlink.cc>, and in (*FlexLink AB v. Spenser Millburn,* WIPO Case No. D2024-0014), concerning the domain name <flexliink.com>.

The disputed domain names <flexlinkscompactspiral.com>, <flexlinkspiral.com>, and <flexlinkspiralconveyor.com> were all registered on February 26, 2026, with the Registrar GoDaddy.com, LLC. The disputed domain names were initially registered behind a privacy service, Domains By Proxy, LLC. Following registrar verification, the Registrar disclosed the underlying registrant as Geraldo Zilli, Vibrating Equipment Limited, United Kingdom.

According to the modified Complaint, the Respondent operates a business under the name Spiral Elevator Ltd.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain names all redirect to Spiral Elevator Ltd.'s website at "www.spiralelevator.com". Evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that, as of September 25, 2026, all three disputed domain names (with and without the "www." prefix) returned an HTTP 301 "Moved Permanently" status, redirecting to their respective HTTPS addresses. At the time of the decision, the disputed domain names redirect to <spiralelevator.com>.

Spiral Elevator Ltd. provides custom-engineered conveying and handling systems, spiral elevators, and vibrating feeders for food, pharmaceutical, and industrial manufacturers across the United Kingdom.

The Respondent answered the Complainant's email sent to the email address provided for contacts on the website at "www.spiralelevator.com".

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.

The Complainant contends that it owns the trademark FLEXLINK, registered in numerous jurisdictions since 1985, and that each of the three disputed domain names incorporates the FLEXLINK mark in its entirety, followed by descriptive terms ("spiral", "compact spiral", "spiral conveyor") that do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The Complainant refers to WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.8, in this regard.

As to rights or legitimate interests, the Complainant submits that it has not granted the Respondent any licence or authorisation to use the FLEXLINK trademark, that the Respondent has no business relationship with the Complainant, and that no evidence suggests the Respondent has any legal rights to the name FLEXLINK. The Complainant argues that the Respondent, which is its direct competitor, has intentionally chosen the disputed domain names to generate traffic to its own website where competing products and services are offered, thereby exploiting the Complainant's goodwill in a "bait-and-switch" manner. The Complainant further notes that the registrant information disclosed by the Registrar does not correspond to the disputed domain names, which it submits is a further indication of a lack of legitimate interest.

As to bad faith, the Complainant contends that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names decades after the Complainant's first FLEXLINK trademark registration, and that, given the Complainant's long history and physical presence in the United Kingdom, including a physical office less than 100 kilometers from the Respondent's address, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's mark at the time of registration. The Complainant argues that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain names to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its competing website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark, in violation of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Complainant further states that it sent a cease-and-desist letter on September 2, 2026, to which the Respondent refused to consent to any voluntary transfer.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not file a formal Response to the Complainant's contentions. The Center received several informal communications from the Respondent during the proceeding, which do not constitute a formal Response complying with Paragraph 5 of the Rules.

In substance, the Respondent expressly withheld consent to the voluntary transfer, surrender, or cancellation of the disputed domain names. The Respondent contested the accuracy and sufficiency of the Complainant's allegations, requesting that the Complainant identify the particular evidence relied upon for each disputed domain name and distinguish recorded facts from inferences and submissions. The Respondent asserted that the disputed domain names are held as private property in the Respondent's personal capacity and are not owned by Vibrating Equipment Limited, and objected to the company designation reflected in the registrant information.

The Respondent disputed the Complainant's characterisation of its earlier data protection requests as having been made for the sole purpose of burdening the Complainant, submitting that making an information request and declining a voluntary transfer do not establish the motive alleged. In a further communication dated October 2, 2026, the Respondent described the Complaint as "mail fraud". The Respondent stated throughout that none of its communications constituted an admission of the allegations or consent to transfer.

The Respondent's informal communications did not address the three substantive elements of the Policy.

6. Discussion and Findings

The registrants of all three disputed domain names were identical: the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center the registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names as "Registrant Name: Geraldo zilli, Registrant Organization: Vibrating Equipment Limited". The Respondent claimed in one of the informal communications that he is the sole owner of the disputed domain names, not Vibrating Equipment Limited. While the Respondent considers the disputed domain names to be held personally, rather than by the listed organization, nothing in the proceeding turns on this distinction and the Panel finds that regardless of external structuring or access control (which the Panel makes no comment on) for the purpose of this proceeding the Panel considers the Respondent to be "Geraldo Zilli, Vibrating Equipment Limited" as provided by the Registrar and in accordance with paragraph 1 of the Rules. The Panel notes that the Respondent has also made various procedural statements and queries directed to the Complainant, for example regarding the source of the disputed domain name registration information and evidence in support of the Complaint. The Panel has fully considered such communications and notes that the Complainant has properly submitted its Complaint under the UDRP, the registration details referenced above were provided by the Registrar pursuant to paragraph 4(b) of the Rules, the Complaint and all supporting evidence were properly transmitted to the Respondent in accordance with paragraph 2(a) of the Rules, and that this Decision will be published in full pursuant to paragraph 4(j) of the Policy. Despite receiving the full Complaint and supporting evidence, the Respondent has not addressed the three substantive elements of the Policy within the 20-day period for Response, and so the Panel will proceed to a decision on the basis of the Complaint in line with paragraph 14 of the Rules.

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 Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here, "scompactspiral", "spiral", and "spiralconveyor", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names. Moreover, the mere redirection of the disputed domain names to a website offering goods competing with the Complainant's goods does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent has not made any claims to the contrary.

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 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.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant's trademarks predate the disputed domain names by decades. Also, the Complainant and the Respondent's business are direct competitors. Furthermore, the Complainant has physical presence only 100 kilometers from the Respondent's address. This leads the Panel to believe that, on the balance of probabilities, the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark at the time of the registration of the disputed domain names. Thus, by registering the disputed domain names, the Respondent intended to attract Internet users looking for the Complainant to the Respondent's website, which shall be considered bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain names redirect to a website, linked with the Respondent's business, where competing products and services are offered. This use of the disputed domain names to redirect Internet users to a competing commercial website constitutes evidence of bad faith registration and use under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 names <flexlinkscompactspiral.com>, <flexlinkspiral.com> and <flexlinkspiralconveyor.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Áron László/
Áron László
Sole Panelist
Date: November 6, 2026