

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SG Schaumglas GmbH & Co. KG v. Gabriel Ängmo, Ängmo Gruppen AB
Case No. DNU2026-0003

1. The Parties

The Complainant is SG Schaumglas GmbH & Co. KG, Germany, represented by Hansson Thyresson AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Gabriel Ängmo, Ängmo Gruppen AB, Sweden, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <glapor.nu> is registered with One.com A/S (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 14, 2026. On September 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 16, 2026, 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 (Ängmo Gruppen AB) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 17, 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 18, 2026.

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 September 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 8, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on October 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Jeremy Speres as the sole panelist in this matter on October 12, 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 manufactures and sells cellular glass gravel for use in construction and civil engineering projects under the trademark GLAPOR.

The Complainant owns, amongst others, European Union Trademark Registration No. 004242228 GLAPOR in classes 7, 8, and 19, having a registration date of February 23, 2006.¹

From late 2020 until August 2025, the Respondent's group of companies bought the Complainant's GLAPOR products on an order-by-order basis and resold them in Sweden. There was never a written distribution agreement between the Parties.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 24, 2020, five days before the Respondent first contacted the Complainant about selling GLAPOR products in Sweden, and it has only ever resolved to a Registrar parking page according to the evidence available in the record.

The Respondent also holds <glapor.se>, which hosted a Swedish website selling the Complainant's products, and <glapor.dk>. The Complainant asked for the transfer of <glapor.se> from January 2025 and ended the relationship on August 7, 2025, following a dispute over the transfer of <glapor.se> and <glapor.dk>. Since then, both <glapor.se> and <glapor.dk> have redirected to the website of the Respondent's company, which promotes competing cellular glass products.

In September 2026, the Respondent offered to transfer all three domain names to the Complainant against a settlement payment and, at the request of the Complainant's representative, named a figure of SEK 78,000.

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 to its distinctive, coined GLAPOR trademark. The Complainant contends further that the Respondent was aware of its mark when registering the disputed domain name, was never granted permission to register or use the GLAPOR mark as a domain name, and it relies on the Respondent's registration of <glapor.se> and <glapor.dk>, which redirect to the Respondent's own website, as a pattern of conduct aimed at its mark. It says the disputed domain name, although inactive, is held to stop the Complainant reflecting its mark in a corresponding domain name and to exploit its goodwill.

¹The Respondent points out that the trademark certificate annexures to the Complaint show that the trademark registration is owned by other parties. However, the Panel consulted the European Union Trademark Register and established that the mark was indeed assigned to the Complainant prior to registration of the disputed domain name. In accordance with its powers articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, the Panel is entitled to conduct limited independent research into matters of public record. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.8.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that he registered the disputed domain name in the context of a genuine commercial relationship, in which his companies developed the Swedish market for, and sold, the Complainant's products from 2020 until the Complainant ended the relationship in August 2025. He denies registering the disputed domain name to sell it, to block the Complainant or to cause confusion. He contends that the placeholder page at the disputed domain name shows no abusive use, and that holding several domain names connected with a genuine distribution relationship is not a pattern of bad faith conduct. He explains that <glapor.se> was redirected so that former customers could still reach his business, and says the SEK 78,000 settlement figure reflected website costs he had incurred, not an attempt to profit from the domain names.

6. Discussion and Findings

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult 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 (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent's rebuttal does not show, on balance of probabilities, that he enjoys rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Here, the Respondent relies on his erstwhile reselling of the Complainant's products, and his use of other domain names (but not the disputed domain name) for this purpose, to claim rights or legitimate interests under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy.

The Respondent has not used the disputed domain name itself for this purpose and, as he accepts, his evidence does not show any use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name. At most, his reselling of the Complainant's products through other "glapor" domain names might be argued to support such a claim.

However, the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's mark, it is well accepted under the Policy that identical domain names carry a high risk of implied affiliation, and panels typically find a lack of rights or legitimate interests in such domain names for resellers. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 2.5.1, and 2.8.2.

The Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name is also problematic under the well-known factors set out in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#) for reseller domain names in that:

1. The Respondent has not actually used the disputed domain name to sell the Complainant's products; and
2. The Respondent's registration of ".se", ".dk" and ".nu" domain names appears to be an attempt at cornering the market in "glapor" domain names.

See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8.1.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Based on the available record, the disputed domain name was registered a few days before the Respondent first approached the Complainant to resell its products. At that point, the Respondent had no relationship with the Complainant, no authorization to register a domain name identical to its mark, and no legitimate expectation of ever receiving such authorization.

At the point of registration, the Respondent undoubtedly had the Complainant's trademark in mind, and in the circumstances of this case, it would appear likely that the Respondent originally registered the disputed domain name in order to leverage it in anticipated negotiations with the Complainant or to otherwise take advantage of it in his relationship with the Complainant. The Respondent's subsequent conduct in relation to the related domain name <glapor.se> leads the Panel to infer that this was his intention at the point of registration of the disputed domain name. In relation to <glapor.se>, the Respondent stated as follows in response to the Complainant's request to transfer the domain name: "...let me know how you see us at ÄngmoAgentur working with Glapor and how you se[e] us in your operation in Sweden and then we can discuss the conditions for us transfer the domainGlapor.se."

This is not a case of a previously authorized distributor, who registered the domain name with authority, subsequently using it in bad faith. Here, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name before any relationship existed, never received authorization, and never used it. His subsequent redirecting of the ".se" and ".dk" domain names to his website selling competing products, and his offer to sell the disputed domain name (along with the other two "glapor" domain names) to the Complainant for a significant sum well beyond the likely out-of-pocket costs relating directly to the disputed domain name, further point to the Respondent's bad faith.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name, including a parking page as in this case, would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. On the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, and the lack of any Respondent rights or legitimate interests, and

finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

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 <glapor.nu> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jeremy Speres/

Jeremy Speres

Sole Panelist

Date: October 20, 2026