

PANEL DECISION

Swedish Match North Europe AB, Philip Morris International, Inc. v. Valter Simonsson

Case No. DEU2026-0017

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Swedish Match North Europe AB, Sweden and Philip Morris International, Inc., United States of America, represented by D.M. Kisch Inc., South Africa.

The Respondent is Valter Simonsson, Sweden.

2. The Domain Name, Registry and Registrar

The Registry of the disputed domain name snuzyn.eu is the European Registry for Internet Domains ("EURid" or the "Registry"). The Registrar of the disputed domain name is GoDaddy.com, LLC.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 30, 2026. On May 1, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registry a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 4, 2026, the Registry 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 and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 7, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registry, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on May 14, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .eu Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules (the "ADR Rules") and the World Intellectual Property Organization Supplemental Rules for .eu Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules (the "Supplemental Rules").

In accordance with the ADR Rules, Paragraph B(2), the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 15, 2026. In accordance with the ADR Rules, Paragraph B(3)(a), the due date for Response was June 4, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on May 21, 2026. The proceedings were suspended on May 28, 2026, to allow the Parties to explore

settlement, however, the Parties did not reach a settlement agreement, and the proceedings were reinstituted on June 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Knud Wallberg as the sole panelist in this matter on June 19, 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 ADR Rules, Paragraph B(5).

4. Factual Background

The First Complainant, Swedish Match North Europe AB, is a Swedish company, subsidiary of the Second Complainant since 2022, which notably manufactures snuff, nicotine pouches and pouch products with neither nicotine nor tobacco, as well as tobacco products.

The Second Complainant, Philip Morris International, Inc., is a well-known American multinational company primarily engaged in the business of manufacturing, marketing and selling cigarettes and smoke-free products, including heated tobacco, e-vapor, and oral smokeless products throughout the world.

The Complainants notably sell nicotine pouches under the trademark ZYN in 40 markets across the globe.

The First Complainant owns various trademark registrations for the trademark ZYN including:

- United States trademark registration No. 5061008 for ZYN (word mark) registered on October 11, 2016 (this trademark was filed and is owned by the Pinkerton Tobacco Co. LP, which is a company part of the group of companies affiliated with the First Complainant);
- International Trademark Registration No. 1421212 for ZYN (word mark) registered on April 18, 2018, designating inter alia, African Intellectual Property Organization, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile, Denmark, Egypt, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Switzerland, Türkiye, Ukraine and United Kingdom; and
- European Union trademark registration no. 017965871 for ZYN (figurative mark) registered on January 25, 2019.

The first Complainant is also the registrant of the domain name <zyn.com>, registered on August 31, 1993, through which they offer ZYN nicotine pouches.

The disputed domain name <snuzyn.eu> was registered on August 1, 2024, and at the time of filing of the Complaint the disputed domain name resolved to a parking site on which it was stated "Get This Domain".

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the ADR Rules for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainants contend that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's ZYN trademark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and that the disputed domain names was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name to the first Complainant.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not file a formal response, but the Respondent did submit an email to the Center, in which it stated that it was willing to transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

6. Discussion and Findings

Considering that panels in earlier .eu cases have established that there are substantive similarities between the ADR Rules and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “UDRP”), this Panel will refer to the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), where appropriate.

6.1 Preliminary Issue: Consolidation of Multiple Complainants

The applicable ADR Rules do not directly contemplate the consolidation of multiple complainants in a single complaint. Prior panels in similar cases involving multiple complainants rendered decisions based on the consensus view developed in the UDRP proceedings and accepted a complaint filed by more than one complainant against a single respondent.

See *Vitalen Otomotiv A.Ş and Vitalen Technology GmbH v. Faith Ünsal*, WIPO Case No. [DEU2022-0001](#), *BGIN Trading Limited and BGIN EU Limited v. Michal Beno*, WIPO Case No. [DEU2025-0038](#), and *Zoho Corporation Private Limited, Zoho Corporation B.V. v. Freja Simmons*, WIPO Case No. [DEU2026-0002](#).

In the present case, the Complainants are affiliated with each other and have a common interest in the ZYN Trademarks for the purposes of the ADR Rules. Consequently, the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name affects their rights in a similar manner. The Panel finds that there is sufficient nexus to allow them to bring this Complaint as joint complainants (hereinafter collectively referred to as “Complainant”).

6.2 Substantive Issues

According to Article 4(4) of the Regulation (EU) 2019/517 of the European Parliament and of the Council of March 19, 2019 on the implementation and functioning of the .eu top level domain name, and paragraph B(11)(d)(1) of the ADR Rules, the Complainant to succeed has to establish the following circumstances: (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a name in respect of which a right is recognized or established by the national law of a Member State and/or European Union law, and; either (ii) that the disputed domain name has been registered by the Respondent without rights or legitimate interest in the name; or

(iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

The Respondent has confirmed in an email communication to the Center that he consents to transfer the disputed domain name to the first Complainant, and the Panel finds that this forms a sufficient basis for an immediate order to transfer the disputed domain name to the first Complainant. See section 4.10 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#); *Leica Microsystems IR GmbH v. Tong Chuang*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-2316](#); and *Wikimedia Foundation, Inc. v. Domains By Proxy, LLC / Adam Bruce, Mixspace Ltd*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-1460](#).

In addition, the Panel notes that there is no doubt that the first Complainant owns valid and existing trademark rights in the ZYN mark, that this mark is clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that the disputed domain name, being confusingly similar to the first Complainant’s mark, was registered and also used in bad faith by virtue of the fact that it has been put up for acquisition.

Accordingly, based on the above, the Panel will order such a transfer to the Complainant.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with Paragraph B(11) of the ADR Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <snuzyn.eu> be transferred to the first Complainant¹.

The Panel finds that the first Complainant meets the general eligibility criteria for registration set out in Article 3 of Regulation (EU) 2019/517.

/Knud Wallberg/

Knud Wallberg

Sole Panelist

Date: June 30, 2026

¹The decision shall be implemented by the Registry within thirty (30) days after the notification of the decision to the Parties, unless the Respondent initiates court proceedings in a Mutual Jurisdiction, as defined in Paragraph A(1) of the ADR Rules.