

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Koninklijke Philips N.V. v. Sayyed Mehdi Ghas al-Husseini
Case No. DIR2025-0011

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Koninklijke Philips N.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the) (the “Netherlands”), represented by React, Netherlands.

The Respondent is Sayyed Mehdi Ghas al-Husseini, Iran (Islamic Republic of), self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <tehranphilips.ir> is registered with IRNIC.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 24, 2025. On November 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to IRNIC a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 26, 2025, IRNIC 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 Complainant on November 27, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on November 28, 2025. Hard copies of the Complaint were received by the Center on December 2, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint the amendment to the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .ir Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “irDRP”), the Rules for .ir Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .ir Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2(a) and 4(a), the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 2, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5(a), the due date for Response was December 22, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on December 3, 2025.

The Center appointed Steven A. Maier as the sole panelist in this matter on January 2, 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 has traded under the name and trademark PHILIPS since 1966, and is an international supplier of professional health products, consumer electronics, personal care products, lighting and domestic appliances.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations in countries around the world for, or incorporating, the mark PHILIPS, including for example:

- International trademark registration number 310459 for the word mark PHILIPS, registered on March 16, 1966, in numerous International Classes; and
- International trademark registration number 991346 for a figurative mark PHILIPS, registered on June 13, 2008, in numerous International Classes, and designating Iran, (Islamic Republic of) (among other countries) under the Madrid Protocol.

The Complainant's PHILIPS trademark has been found by panels under the Uniform Domain Name Resolution Policy ("UDRP") to have attained the status of a well-known trademark (see e.g. *Koninklijke Philips Electronics N.V. v. Philip Vlasov*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-2274](#))¹.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 30, 2023.

The Complainant provides evidence that the disputed domain name has resolved to a website headed PHILIPS and "Introducing the Tehran Philips site – Philips company's specialized store". The website appears to offer the Complainant's products for sale. It includes an image of a PHILIPS branded office building, with the caption "Philips Tehran Representative Office Philips" and also claims to be "a Philips representative".

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant refers to the well-known status of its PHILIPS trademark. It submits that its mark represents one of the most widely recognized corporate entities in the world, by virtue of its extensive international sales and marketing, both on its own behalf and via its licensees (although no further particulars or financial information are provided).

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to its PHILIPS trademark. It submits that the disputed domain name incorporates that mark in full, preceded by the term "tehran", being a geographic term, which does not reduce the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the trademark.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. It states that the Respondent is not its authorized representative, is not commonly known by

¹ While this proceeding falls under the irDRP rather than the UDRP, similar considerations are applicable in this instance given the close identity between the respective policy terms.

the disputed domain name, and has no independent rights in any corresponding trademark. Insofar as the Respondent's website offers the Complainant's products, the Complainant submits that the Respondent misrepresents itself as an official representative of the Complainant, even including a section about the Complainant's company history on its website. It observes, in particular, that the Respondent's website includes no accurate or prominent disclosure of its relationship with the trademark holder, as required by the accepted principles laid down in *Ok! Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#), and followed in *Philip Morris Products S.A. v. Saeed Sarbandi Farahani, Persian Art*, WIPO Case No. [DIR2022-0002](#), which was decided under the irDRP.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered or is being used in bad faith. It submits that, in view of the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name, it is clear that it had the Complainant's PHILIPS trademark in mind, and intended to refer to that trademark, when it registered the disputed domain name. It adds that the registration of the disputed domain name, incorporating as it does the Complainant's well-known trademark, carries a high risk of implied affiliation between the disputed domain name and the trademark. The Complainant submits that, by presenting itself as an authorized representative of the Complainant in Iran (Islamic Republic of), and failing to disclose the lack of any such relationship, the Respondent creates the false and misleading impression that its website must be operated by the Complainant or a company legitimately affiliated with it. It is, therefore, manifestly intended to exploit the reputation of the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent submits that it has acted at all times in good faith and without any intention to deceive. It states that all the products on its website are genuine, accurately presented, and comply with all the laws and regulations of Iran (Islamic Republic of).

The Respondent states that its brand, domain name and content are clearly distinct from those of the Complainant. It submits that it uses the term "representation" on its website to refer to its own operations comprising multiple stores, and not to imply a connection with the Complainant. It contends that all of the criteria set out in the *Ok! Data* case are met, since it sells only the Complainant's genuine products, its website clearly indicates that it is not an official site of the Complainant's, and it makes no attempt to monopolize domain names or mislead customers: it includes the PHILIPS name only to indicate that it sells the Complainant's products.

The Respondent states that it has been distributing genuine PHILIPS products in Iran (Islamic Republic of) for over 15 years, and has been able to maintain the reputation and credibility of the Complainant's mark, despite the sanctions and other limitations that are present in the country, and the proliferation of counterfeit goods offered in Iran (Islamic Republic of) by other sellers.

The Respondent states that it has "updated" its website to prevent any potential misunderstanding among consumers, although it does not provide particulars or any supporting evidence.

The Respondent submits, in the circumstances, that it has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that it registered and has used the disputed domain name in good faith. It contends that the Complaint should therefore be dismissed.

6. Discussion and Findings

In order to succeed in the Complaint, the Complainant is required to show that all three of the elements set out under paragraph 4(a) of the irDRP are present. Those elements are that:

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

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has demonstrated that it is the owner of registered trademark rights in the mark PHILIPS. The disputed domain name wholly incorporates that mark, preceded by the geographical term “tehran”, the inclusion of which does not prevent the Complainant’s trademark from being recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The first element under the Policy is therefore satisfied.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The disputed domain name includes the Complainant’s well-known PHILIPS trademark, together with the geographical term “tehran”, giving rise to a significant risk of consumers being misled into believing that the Respondent’s website is in fact an official or authorized website of the Complainant’s for Iran (Islamic Republic of). Where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term, panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. That is the case here.

In certain limited circumstances, a reseller of trademarked goods or services may legitimately incorporate that trademark into a domain name used for the resale of the goods or services in question (see, e.g., section 2.8 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”)²). However, one of the key criteria in this regard is that the reseller must accurately and prominently disclose its relationship with the trademark owner.

Despite the Respondent’s protestations in this regard, the Panel finds not only that the Respondent has failed to disclose its relationship (or lack thereof) with the Complainant, but has actively created an impression of an official connection by its use of website content including the term “a Philips representative”, and the caption “Philips Tehran Representative Office Philips” together with an image of a PHILIPS branded corporate building. The *Ok! Data* conditions are not therefore satisfied, and the Panel finds moreover that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name is misleading.

The second element under the Policy is therefore satisfied.

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

Similar considerations as above apply to the issues of registration or use of the disputed domain name in bad faith.

It is clear from the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name that it registered and has used the disputed domain name with the Complainant’s trademark in mind, and with the specific intention of promoting the Complainant’s products. This the Respondent does not deny. However, not only does the disputed domain name itself carry a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant’s well-known trademark, but the Respondent positively exacerbates that risk of confusion by way of its website content as described above. The Panel finds in the circumstances that Internet users are likely to believe that the Respondent’s website must be owned or operated by, or otherwise legitimately affiliated with, the Complainant, and that by using

² As per footnote 1 above.

the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or of a product or service on its website (paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy).

The third element under the Policy is therefore satisfied.

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 <tehranphilips.ir> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Steven A. Maier/

Steven A. Maier

Sole Panelist

January 14, 2026