

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Archer-Daniels-Midland Company v. mehmetavniaydins metavnaiydins
Case No. DBZ2025-0002

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Archer-Daniels-Midland Company, United States of America (“United States” or “U.S.”), represented by Innis Law Group LLC, United States.

The Respondent is mehmetavniaydins metavnaiydins, Nigeria.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <adm.bz> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 26, 2025. On November 27, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On November 27, 2025, 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 (Unknown/Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 28, 2025, 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 December 1, 2025.

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 December 3, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 23, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 24, 2025.

The Center appointed Yuzo Wada as the sole panelist in this matter on January 7, 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, founded in 1902, is a large agricultural products company. It has used the ADM trademark since 1923.

The Complainant holds trade mark registrations in a number of jurisdictions, such as United States wordmark ADM registered under No. 1386430 on March 18, 1986, in classes 1, 4, 12, 16, 29, 30, 31, and 39. The Complainant uses its domain name <adm.com> for employees' email addresses as well as its primary website.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on August 25, 2025, and does not resolve to an active website.

The evidence provided by the Complainant shows that the Disputed Domain Name has been used for a fraudulent email scheme. The Disputed Domain Name was used to create an email address which falsely appears to belong to a legitimate employee of the Complainant. The email address was used to send fraudulent emails soliciting payments from a business partner of the Complainant. Fraudulent invoices as evidenced by the Complainant show that the Complainant's registered logo mark and the name of an impersonated employee have been used in those invoices.

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 identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's ADM trademark.

The Complainant alleges that the Respondent lacks any rights to or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the complainant prove each of the following three elements to obtain a decision that a domain name should be either cancelled or transferred:

- (i) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
- (iii) the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has registered rights in the mark ADM. The Panel further finds that the Disputed Domain Name is identical to this mark, since the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the entirety of the Complainant's trademark. The country code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".bz" to the Disputed Domain Name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under the second element of the Policy, the Complainant must show that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent may establish a right or legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name by demonstrating any of the following non-exhaustive circumstances listed in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy:

- (a) that the Respondent has used, or made 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 prior to any notice of the dispute; or
- (b) that the Respondent has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, even if the Respondent has not acquired any trademark rights; or
- (c) that 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.

The Complainant's trademark registrations for ADM predate the Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name which is identical to the Complainant's trademark (save for the ccTLD). The Complainant has not licensed or otherwise consented to the Respondent's use of its trademarks in connection with the Disputed Domain Name.

From the evidence in the case record, the Disputed Domain Name is connected to an email address that was used to send emails impersonating an employee of the Complainant, attempting to mislead a third-party company into believing it had received legitimate business communications from the Complainant. The Respondent is therefore not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name, nor does such use constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Panel has held that the use of the Disputed Domain Name for such fraudulent activity can never confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Thus, there is no evidence in the case record that refutes the Complainant's submissions, and the Panel concludes that the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

According to paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, shall be evidence of the registration and use in bad faith:

- (i) circumstances indicating that the Respondent has registered or has acquired the Disputed Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Disputed Domain Name registration to the Complainant who is the owner of the trademark 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 Disputed Domain Name; or
- (ii) the Respondent has registered the Disputed Domain Name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding Disputed Domain Name, provided that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) the Respondent has registered the Disputed Domain Name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) by using the Disputed 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 its website or location.

Based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered after the Complainant first acquired rights in the ADM trademark. Without the authorization of the Complainant, the Respondent is using the Complainant's trademark through the Disputed Domain Name and associated email address to impersonate an employee of the Complainant and to mislead one of the Complainant's business partners into believing it is continuing a legitimate communication with that employee. The Respondent has sent emails from the said email address attaching documents containing the Complainant's registered logo trademark, the name of an impersonated employee of the Complainant, and new banking details, in an attempt to solicit payments from the Complainant's business partner.

On top of that, the Panel accepts the Complainant's contention that the Complainant's trademark ADM is well known (*Archer-Daniels-Midland Company v. Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1618](#); *Archer-Daniels-Midland Company v. Warren Flaherty, Allwood Design and Manufacture Ltd / Identity Protect Limited*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-0539](#)). The incorporation of a well-known trademark into a domain name by an unaffiliated entity having no plausible explanation for doing so may be, in and of itself, an indication of bad faith (*Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin, Maison Fondée en 1772 v. The Polygenix Group Co.*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0163](#); *General Electric Company v. CPIC NET and Hussain Syed*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0087](#); *Microsoft Corporation v. Montrose Corporation*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-1568](#); *Intel Corporation v. The Pentium Group*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-0273](#)).

In light of the above, the Respondent deliberately chose the Disputed Domain Name for its confusing similarity with the Complainant's trademark and the Complainant's domain name <adm.com>, which the Complainant uses for its employees' email addresses. The Respondent did so with the intention of impersonating an employee of the Complainant and commercially benefiting therefrom by deceiving the Complainant's business partner through fraudulent email communications. That constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4).

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 <adm.bz> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Yuzo Wada/

Yuzo Wada

Sole Panelist

Date: January 21, 2026