Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107933

Case number	**CAC-UDRP-107933**
Time of filing	**2025-09-11 11:45:54**
Domain names	**arla.network**

Case administrator

Name	**Olga Dvořáková (Case admin)**

Complainant

Organization	**Arla Foods Amba**

Complainant representative

Organization	**Abion GmbH**

Respondent

Name	**Otoniel Reyes**

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings which are pending or decided and which relate to the disputed domain name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for ARLA, such as but not limited to:

- US Trademark registration ARLA No. 3325019, registered on 30 October 2007;
- EU Trademark registration ARLA No. 001520899, registered on 7 May 2001;
- International Trademark registration ARLA® No. 731917, registered on 20 March 2000;
- International trademark ARLA (figurative) No. 990596, registered on 8 September 2008;
- DK Trademark registration ARLA SUSTAINABLE NETWORK No. VR 2022 00061, registered on 27 December 2021.

The Complainant also owns numerous domain names containing its trademarks, including <arla.com> (registered 15 July 1996), <arlausa.com> (registered 02 August 2006), <arla.ph> (registered 31 August 2001), <arla.eu> (registered 01 June 2006), <arlafoods.com> (registered 01 October 1999), <arlafoods.co.uk> (registered 01 October 1999), and <arlafoods.ca> (registered 29 November 2000). These domain names resolve to their official websites, through which it inform Internet users and potential consumers about its ARLA mark and related products and services.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is the fifth-largest dairy company in the world and a cooperative owned by more than 7,600 dairy farmers and 21,895

employees. The Complainant was incorporated as Arla Foods amba on 17 April 2000, when the largest Danish dairy cooperative, MD Foods, merged with its Swedish counterpart, Arla ekonomisk Förening. The Complainant employs around 20,900 full-time staff and achieved a global revenue of EUR € 13.770 billion for the year 2024, with a profit of EUR € 417 million.

The Complainant's products are easily recognised by consumers worldwide due to its significant investments in promoting its products and brands and offering high-quality goods. It sells milk-based products under its famous trademark ARLA, as well as under other well-known marks such as LURPAK, CASTELLO, and APETINA.

Since the Complainant is incorporated as a cooperative, it is often referred to in commercial and public settings as a "network" of farmers, producers, and suppliers.

The Complainant also enjoys a strong global and online presence through its official website and social media platforms. Due to extensive use, advertising, and revenue associated with its trademarks worldwide, the Complainant enjoys a high degree of renown.

According to the Registrar Verification issued on 11 September 2025, the disputed domain name was registered on 5 June 2023, and transferred to the Respondent on 27 November 2023. At the time of filing this complaint, the website to which the disputed domain name resolves performs a permanent redirection to the front page of the well-known search engine Google, at https://www.google.com/.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it.

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

It is well established that the specific top level of a domain name such as ".network" does not affect the domain name for the purpose of determining whether it is identical or confusingly similar. The disputed domain name is therefore considered identical to the Complainant´s trademark ARLA.

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Respondent to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

The circumstances set out in the Factual Background shows to the Panel that the Respondent was most likely fully aware of the Complainant's very widely known ARLA mark when the Respondent registered the disputed domain name and that the Respondent has had the purpose to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source of the Respondent's website and of the products promoted on that website. This demonstrates registration and use in bad faith.

Furthermore, the Panel finds that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical to a widely known trademark by an unaffiliated entity is sufficient to create a presumption of bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

The Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under UDRP were met and there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

1. The three essential issues under the paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are whether:

i. the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and

ii. the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name; and

iii. the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

2. The Panel reviewed carefully all documents provided by the Complainant. The Respondent did not provide the Panel with any documents or statements. The Panel also visited all available websites and public information concerning the disputed domain name, namely the WHOIS databases.

3. The UDRP Rules clearly say in its Article 3 that any person or entity may initiate an administrative proceeding by submitting a complaint in accordance with the Policy and these Rules.

4. The Panel therefore came to the following conclusions:

a) The Complainant states and proves that the disputed domain name is identical to its trademarks and its domain names.

b) The Respondent is not generally known by the disputed domain name and has not acquired any trademark or service mark rights in the name or mark, nor is there any authorization for the Respondent by the Complainant to use or register the disputed domain name.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interest with respect to the disputed domain name.

c) It is clear that the Complainant's trademarks and website(s) were used by the Complainant long time before the disputed domain name was registered.

It is concluded that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical to a widely known trademark by an unaffiliated entity is sufficient to create a presumption of bad faith.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

For the reasons stated above, it is the decision of this Panel that the Complainant has satisfied all three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

AND THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME(S) IS (ARE) TO BE

1. **arla.network**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Lars Karnoe**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-10-21

Publish the Decision