Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108365

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108365
Time of filing	2026-01-30 10:28:52
Domain names	arlafoodsingredient.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Arla Foods Amba

Complainant representative

Organization	Abion GmbH

Respondent

Name	Caesar Malone

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 the marks ARLA and ARLA FOODS, such as:

- US trademark registration ARLA No. 3325019, registered on 30 October 2007;
- US trademark registration ARLA No. 3651489, registered on 7 July 2009;
- International trademark registration ARLA No. 731917, registered on 20 March 2000;
- International trademark registration ARLA FOODS No. 1829124, registered on 2 October 2024.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Arla Foods Ingredients Group P/S is a fully owned subsidiary of the Complainant and is responsible for the Complainant's global ingredients business. It owns the domain name <arlafoodsingredients.com> (registered 16 March 2000), which Complainant alleges is used in connection with official business activities and online presence, including providing information about ARLA-branded ingredients products and services.

The Disputed Domain Name <arlafoodsingredient.com> was registered on 1 November 2025 by a third party unrelated to the Complainant. The Complainant alleges that the Disputed Domain Name was used shortly after its registration as part of an elaborate phishing and impersonation scheme targeting the Complainant's business partners. The Disputed Domain Name was

allegedly configured to create email addresses impersonating employees of the Complainant, and allegedly was used to conduct extended email correspondence with third parties. MX records associated with the Disputed Domain Name remain active, indicating that the domain is configured for email communication.

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). The Disputed Domain Name incorporates, in its second-level portion, the Complainant's ARLA and ARLA FOODS trademarks in their entirety, together with the descriptive term "ingredient", which directly refers to the Complainant's ingredients business and only enhances the finding of confusing similarity. The Complainant's ARLA and ARLA FOODS trademarks remain clearly recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name.

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). The Complainant alleges that it has never granted the Respondent any rights to use the ARLA or ARLA FOODS trademarks in any form, including in the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent's name, "Caesar Malone" does not correspond to the Disputed Domain Name or to the Complainant's ARLA and ARLA FOODS trademarks.

However, the structure of the Disputed Domain Name – incorporating in its second-level portion the Complainant's ARLA and ARLA FOODS trademarks together with the descriptive term "ingredient" – directly refers to the Complainant's business activities in the field of food and dairy ingredients. The inclusion of such a descriptive term, which is closely associated with the Complainant and its products and services, creates a misleading impression that the Disputed Domain Name is affiliated with, or authorized by, the Complainant.

At the time the Complainant discovered the Disputed Domain Name, it was being used as part of a fraudulent phishing scheme targeting the Complainant's business partners. The Disputed Domain Name was configured to create email addresses impersonating senior employees of the Complainant and was used to conduct extended email correspondence with third parties. Through these deceptive communications, the Respondent falsely represented itself as the Complainant and sought to disclose sensitive business and financial information. The use of the Disputed Domain Name for such fraudulent purposes clearly demonstrates that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

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). Indeed, the structure of the Disputed Domain Name – incorporating in its second-level portion the Complainant's ARLA and ARLA FOODS trademarks together with the descriptive term "ingredient" – shows that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name having the Complainant and its ARLA and ARLA FOODS trademarks in mind. This structure reflects the Respondent's clear intention to create an association, and a consequent likelihood of confusion, with the Complainant's trademarks in the minds of Internet users. By reading the Disputed Domain Name, Internet users may reasonably believe that it is directly connected to, or authorized by the Complainant.

This conclusion is further reinforced by the fact that the Disputed Domain Name shortly after its registration, and as previously mentioned, was used in connection with email communications as part of an impersonation and phishing scheme.

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

The Disputed Domain Name, shortly after its registration, was used in connection with email communications as part of an impersonation and phishing scheme. The use of the Disputed Domain Name for such fraudulent purposes clearly demonstrates that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. Moreover, such conduct proves the Disputed Domain Name was registered and used in bad faith in violation of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **arlafoodsingredient.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Mike Rodenbaugh**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-02-27

Publish the Decision