

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Moomin Characters Oy Ltd. v. Privacy Department, IceNetworks Ltd.
Case No. DCC2025-0015

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Moomin Characters Oy Ltd., Finland, represented by Roschier (Brands), Attorneys Ltd., Finland.

The Respondent is Privacy Department, IceNetworks Ltd., Iceland.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <moominmarket.cc>, <moominvalley.cc>, <mumindalen.cc> and <muumilaakso.cc> (the “Domain Names”) are registered with Internet Domain Service BS Corp Internet Domain Service BS Corp (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 24, 2025. On July 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Names. On July 29, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Names which differed from the named Respondent (Domain Admin, Whois Privacy Corp.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 29, 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 amended Complaint July 30, 2025.

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 July 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 19, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 21, 2025.

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on August 29, 2025. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

Moomins (in Finnish: “Muumit” and in Swedish: “Mumin”) are the central characters in a series of books, and a comic strip by the Finnish illustrator and writer Ms. Tove Jansson. In all, nine books were released in the series, together with five picture books and a comic strip, between 1945 and 1993. The books have been translated into more than 40 languages. The Complainant is the exclusive owner of the rights to Moomin and Moomin characters derived from the author of the books. In addition to the books and the comic strip, Moomins have been a basis for several television series, films, theme parks, shops, cafes and museums.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations in MOOMIN globally, see for example European Union trademark registration no. 013532528 (registration date November 10, 2016). Similarly, the Complainant owns trademark registrations in MUUMI (such as European Union trademark registration no. 013530308, registration date May 20, 2015), MUMIN (such as Finnish trademark registration no. 267828, registration date October 28, 2016), and MOOMINVALLEY (such as European Union trademark registration no. 017165945, registration date December 27, 2017).

The Respondent registered three of the four Domain Names on March 16, 2025. The fourth, <moominmarket.cc>, was registered on June 8, 2025. The Complainant documents that the Domain Names have redirected to a website that contains narcotics trade and related content. The website also contains unauthorized use of the Complainant’s MOOMIN trademark.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant provides evidence of trademark registrations and argues that the Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks. The Complainant’s trademarks are fully incorporated into the Domain Names. The addition of descriptive terms such as “market”, “laakso” and “dalen” does not prevent the finding of the confusing similarity. The latter two additions are translated as “valley” from Finnish and Swedish.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Names. The Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or permitted the Respondent to register domain names incorporating the Complainant’s trademark. The Domain Names have directed to a website that contains narcotics trade and unauthorized use of the Complainant’s trademark. The use of the Domain Names is not only misleading as to source or sponsorship, but functions as tarnish. It is in itself evidence of the Respondent not having rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent by creating domain names that are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark and using them for a website that contains narcotics trade and unauthorized use of the Complainant’s trademark, has demonstrated knowledge of the Complainant’s brand. The Respondent uses the Domain Names for commercial gain and attract Internet users to its darknet website. The Respondent has concealed its real identity, not surprising considering the content of its website, which is further indication of bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain names. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has established that it has rights in MOOMIN, MUUMI, MUMIN and MOOMINVALLEY. The Domain Names incorporate the Complainant's trademarks with the addition of descriptive terms such as "market", "laakso" and "dalen". The additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7. and 1.8.

For the purpose of assessing the confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel may ignore the country-code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD"). See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, 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. While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. The Respondent is not affiliated or related to the Complainant. There is no evidence that the Respondent has registered the Domain Names as a trademark or acquired trademark rights. There is no evidence of the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Names or names corresponding to the Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, the Respondent has used the Domain Names for a website that contains narcotics trade and unauthorized use of the Complainant's trademark.

Based on the available record, 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.

The incorporation of the Complainant's trademarks in the Domain Names, and the use of the Complainant's trademark on the Respondent's website, prove that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its prior rights when the Respondent registered the Domain Names. The use of the Domain Names is clear evidence of bad faith use. The Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website. The Respondent's use tarnishes the Complainant's trademarks.

For the reasons set out above, the Panel concludes that the Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. The third element of the Policy has been established.

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 Domain Names <moominmarket.cc>, <moominvalley.cc>, <mumindalen.cc> and <muumilaakso.cc> transferred to the Complainant.

/Mathias Lilleengen/

Mathias Lilleengen

Sole Panelist

Date: September 9, 2025