Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108239

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108239
Time of filing	2025-12-15 10:51:37
Domain names	ikea-shop-online.com, ikea-online-shop.org

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Inter IKEA Systems B.V.

Complainant representative

Organization	Convey srl

Respondent

Organization	Identity Protection Service

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 names.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant has proved to own the following trademark rights, inter alia:

- German trademark IKEA n°DE867152 registered on March 12, 1970, and duly renewed;
- US trademark IKEA n°1118706 registered on May 22, 1979, and duly renewed;
- European Union trademark IKEA n°000109652 registered on October 1, 1998, and duly renewed;
- European Union trademark IKEA n°000109637 registered on October 8, 1998, and duly renewed;
- International trademark IKEA n°926155 registered on April 24, 2007, duly renewed;

- Lao People's Democratic Republic trademark IKEA n°51668 registered on August 25, 2021;

- Lao People's Democratic Republic trademark IKEA n°51669 registered on August 25, 2021.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

IKEA is a well-known Swedish home furnishing company, with more than four hundred stores. The IKEA Group employs approximately 222,000 people worldwide, operating in over fifty markets and attracting nearly one billion visitors per year. The use of the sign IKEA started more than 70 years ago. The Complainant holds trademark registrations in more than 80 countries around the world.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain names <ikea-shop-online.com> on May 14, 2025 and <ikea-online-shop.org> on August 24, 2025.

The Complainant submitted the following documents to prove the abovementioned facts:

- Annex 1.1: German Trademark Registration n. DE867152 of March 12, 1970 in class 20;
- Annex 1.2: U.S Trademark Registration n. 1118706 of May 22, 1979 in classes 11, 20, 21, 24, 27;
- Annex 1.3: European Union Trademark Registration n. 000109652 of October 1, 1998 in classes 2, 8,
- 11, 16, 18, 20, 21, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 35, 36, 39, 41, 42;
- Annex 1.4: European Union Trademark Registration n. 000109637 of October 8, 1998 in classes 2, 8,
- 11, 16, 18, 20, 21, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 35, 26, 39, 41, 42;
- Annex 1.5: International Trademark Registration n. 926155 of April 24, 2007 in class 16, 20, 35, 43, designating also China;
- Annex 1.6: Lao People's Democratic Republic Trademark Registration n. 51668 of August 25, 2021, in classes 8, 9, 11, 16, 18, 20, 21, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 43;
- Annex 1.7: Lao People's Democratic Republic Trademark Registration n. 51669 of August 25, 2021, in classes 8, 9, 11, 16, 18, 20, 21, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 43;
- Annex 2: IKEA Group’s figures;
- Annex 3: screenshots of IKEA brochures;
- Annex 4: screenshots of the card “IKEA family”;
- Annex 5: screenshot of the magazine IKEA Family Live;
- Annex 6: screenshot of IKEA Foundation;
- Annex 7: screenshot of Complainant’s museum;
- Annex 8: screenshot of the Best Global Brands of Interbrand in 2025 about the ranking of IKEA;
- Annex 9: screenshot of the website www.ikea.com;
- Annex 10: screenshot of the launch of the augmented reality and IKEA Place app;
- Annex 11: copy of the whois of the domain name “ikea-shop-online.com”
- Annex 12: screenshot of the website corresponding to the domain name “ikea-shop-online.com” on November, 28, 2025;
- Annex 13: copy of the whois of the domain name “ikea-online-shop.org”;
- Annex 14: screenshot of the website corresponding to the domain name “ikea-online-shop.org” on November, 28, 2025;
- Annex 15: copy of the cease and desist letter sent on November, 5, 2025 to the email address of the owner of the domain name ikea-shop-online.com;
- Annex 16: copy of the cease and desist letter sent on November, 28, 2025 to the email address of the owner of the domain name ikea-online-shop.org;
- Annex 17: incomplete Address Details of the Respondent.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant requests consolidation of claims concerning the disputed domain names into a single proceeding. Pursuant to the registrar’s disclosure, it has been confirmed that the domain names were registered by the same registrant and the disputed domain names share similar technical configuration, and timing of registration.

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain names 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 names are 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).

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 names (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 names have been registered and are being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

The Panel has considered the record, the UDRP Rules, and the WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0.

Under Rules 10(b) and 10(c) of the UDRP Rules, the Panel must balance procedural efficiency with equality of treatment and fairness to all parties.

The disputed domain names were registered within close temporal proximity, share the same registrant and registrar. On that basis, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain names are under common control and grants the Complainant's request for consolidation.

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

Identity (paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy)

The Panel finds that the disputed domain names <ikea-shop-online.com> and <ikea-online-shop.org> are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s IKEA trademarks.

Indeed, the Complainant’s IKEA trademarks are incorporated in the disputed domain names in their entirety with the addition of the hyphen “-” as well as of the generic and descriptive terms “shop” and “online” accompanying the word IKEA. Nevertheless, such an addition does not avoid confusion between the disputed domain names and the Complainant’s trademarks. (See Fendi S.r.l. v. Federico Porcedda, Case No. D2018-1265).

Thus, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to Complainant’s trademarks.

Absence of Rights or Legitimate Interests (paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy)

The Complainant asserted that the Respondent has never authorized to use the Complainant’s IKEA trademarks in the disputed domain names. Consequently, the Panel finds that the Respondent lacks any right or legitimate interest in using the disputed domain names.

Furthermore, the Panel notes that there has been no evidence showing that Respondent has any registered trademark rights with respect to the disputed domain names and is using the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Finally, the Respondent had the opportunity to provide its arguments in support of its rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. However, by failing to file a response, the Respondent has missed this opportunity and the Panel is entitled to draw such inferences from the Respondent's failure as it considers appropriate in accordance with Paragraph 14 of the Rules.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names.

Bad faith (paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.)

In light of the records, the Complainant showed that the disputed domain names are consequently similar to the well-known IKEA trademarks. The Panel finds that the Respondent cannot reasonably pretend it was intending to develop a legitimate activity through the disputed domain names. Indeed, the Complainant’s IKEA trademarks have no meaning and are completely original and distinctive. It is inconceivable to the Panel that the Respondent could have coincidentally chosen the disputed domain names without knowledge of the Complainant’s IKEA trademarks. Arguably, the Respondent registered the disputed domain names knowing that the trademark benefited from a worldwide reputation. Moreover, the time of the registration, namely May 2025, is well posterior to the registration of IKEA trademarks.

Therefore, it is clear to the Panel that the Respondent was well aware of the IKEA trademarks and has registered the disputed domain names with the intention to refer to the Complainant and to its trademarks.

Furthermore, it seems that the Respondent has registered the dispute domain names in bad faith for the sole purpose of attracting Internet users for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s IKEA trademarks. In fact, the disputed domain names resolve to websites that sell products and reproduce the Complainant’s IKEA trademarks. Such use is likely to mislead consumers for the Respondent’s benefit and to divert them from the Complainant’s genuine business. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

To the Panel’s opinion, this shows that the disputed domain names were registered in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **ikea-shop-online.com**: Transferred
2. **ikea-online-shop.org**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Nathalie Dreyfus**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-01-16

Publish the Decision