ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Alma Media Finland Oy v. Umer Mirza, EBPRO Media LTD
Case No. DIO2026-0047

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Alma Media Finland Oy, Finland, represented by Castrén & Snellman, Finland.

The Respondent is Umer Mirza, EBPRO Media LTD, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name(s) and Registrar(s)

The disputed domain name <iltalehti.io> (the "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 September 11, 2026. On September 11, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On September 14, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 15, 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 16, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Policy"), the Rules for .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .IO 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 16, 2026.

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on October 20, 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 to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a Finnish media and service company focusing on digital services and publishing. The Complaint is based on the Complainant's trademark ILTALEHTI. Iltalehti is one of Finland's largest news outlets and a versatile lifestyle media platform.

The Complainant owns several trademark registrations, such as Finnish trademark registration no. 201202 (registered on July 31, 1996) for ILTALEHTI. The Complainant is also the holder of the domain name <iltalehti.fi>, registered more than 30 years ago.

The Domain Name was registered on August 8, 2024. The Complainant provides evidence that the Domain Name has redirected to the website <tuoreimmatuutiset.fi>. The title of the website "Tuoreimmat Uutiset" translates to "Latest News" in English.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant provides evidence of trademark registrations that predate the registration of the Domain Name. The Complainant argues that the Domain Name reproduces the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, without any addition, alteration, or other distinguishing element whatsoever. It is therefore identical to the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Respondent is not authorized to register or use a domain name incorporating the Complainant's
trademark. The Respondent's use of the Domain Name is not for legitimate noncommercial or fair use, but rather evidence of bad faith.

Based on the Complainant's prior rights and the Respondent's use of the Domain Name, the Complainant argues that the Respondent had knowledge of the Complainant and attempted to benefit from the reputation of the Complainant's trademark, when the Respondent registered the Domain Name. The Complainant
submits that use of the Domain Name for the same services as the Complainant's trademark is used for, further emphasizes the bad faith. The Respondent's use causes a significant risk that a visitor will mistake the Domain Name for being a website monitored and operated by the Complainant. The Respondent has attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's registered trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. Moreover, the Respondent has a history of registering domain names in bad faith. In a recent decision, *Yleisradio Oy v Umer Mirza, EBPRO Media LTD*, WIPO Case No. D2025-2762, the Panel concluded that the Respondent's registration of a domain name incorporating a trademark of another Finnish news outlet was registered and being used in 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 Domain Name. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.7.1[1].

The Complainant has established that it has rights in ILTALEHTI. The Domain Name is identical to the Complainant's trademark. For the purpose of assessing the confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel may disregard the Top-Level Domain; see WIPO Overview 3.1, 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 ioDRP 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 3.1, 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 Name. 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 Name. The Respondent is not affiliated or related to the Complainant. There is no evidence that the Respondent has registered the Domain Name as a trademark or acquired trademark rights. There is no evidence of the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the
Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent's use of the Domain Name, as described above, is rather evidence of bad faith, see below.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered or 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.

Based on the use and composition of the Domain Name, as well as the fame of the Complainant's trademark in Finland, it is evident that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant when the Respondent registered the Domain Name. The said use of the Domain Name reflects the Respondent's intention to create confusion with the Complainant's trademark and serves as evidence of bad faith use under the paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Respondent has used the Domain Name to attract, for

[1] Given the similarities between the Policy and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "UDRP"), the Panel will refer to the WIPO Overview 3.1 where relevant to this proceeding.

commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. Furthermore, the Respondent has already been found to have registered and used a domain name incorporating a trademark of another Finnish news outlet in bad faith as decided in *Yleisradio Oy v Umer Mirza, EBPRO Media LTD*, WIPO Case No. D2025-2762.

For the reasons set out above, the Panel concludes that the Domain Name was registered and is 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 the Domain Name <iltalehti.io> transferred to the Complainant.

/Mathias Lilleengen/
Mathias Lilleengen
Sole Panelist
Date: October 23, 2026