Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108352

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108352
Time of filing	2026-01-23 09:42:25
Domain names	arla-uk.com, arlavita.vip, arlavita.online, arlavita.com, arlavitavip.com, arlagreen.com, arla-gt.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Arla Foods Amba

Complainant representative

Organization	Abion GmbH

Respondent

Name	BI NIU

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 is the owner of a large portfolio of ARLA marks, registered in various jurisdictions worldwide, among which the following:

- ARLA (word mark), US trademark registration No. 3325019, registered on 30 October 2007, for goods in classes 1 and 29;

- ARLA (figurative mark), US trademark registration No. 3651489, registered on 7 July 2009, for goods in classes 1 and 29;

- ARLA (figurative mark), Hong Kong trademark registration No. 301205838, registered on 6 October 2009, for goods in classes 1, 5, 29, 30, 31 and 32.

The Complainant is also the owner of numerous domain names, consisting of, or containing, the ARLA mark, including <arla.com>, registered on 15 July 1996, <arlausa.com>, registered on 2 August 2006, <arlafoods.co.uk>, registered on 01 October 1999, <arla.eu>, registered 01 June 2006, <arla.vip>, registered 18 May 2016, and <arlafoodsvip.com>, registered 31 March 2024. These domain names resolve to the Complainant's official websites, through which it informs Internet users and potential consumers about its ARLA trademark 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 12,500 dairy farmers. The Complainant was established in 2000, when the largest Danish dairy cooperative MD Foods merged with its Swedish counterpart Arla ekonomisk Förening. The Complainant employs a little less than 22,000 people and reached a global revenue of EUR 13,8 billion in 2024. The Complainant operates in 39 countries worldwide, including in the European Union, the United States of America ("USA"), and the UK. In the US, the Complainant operates through two local subsidiaries. In the UK, the Complainant operates from its headquarters in Leeds and maintains numerous production, packing, distribution and logistic facilities across the country. The Complainant has also an established online presence, through various dedicated websites and the most important social media platforms.

The disputed domain names were all registered on 10 November 2025 by an individual allegedly located in Hong Kong. The disputed domain names resolve to websites featuring the Complainant's ARLA figurative mark, the Complainant's copyrighted photographs and other general information of the Complainant. The disputed domain name <arla-gt.cm> resolves to a webpage displaying the ARLA figurative trademark and the message: “Please use your mobile phone to open the download.”

Before starting this UDRP proceeding, the Complainant sent a takedown notice and a follow-up reminder to the hosting provider of the disputed domain names, but received no answer.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

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

According to the Complainant, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its ARLA mark, as they incorporate the mark together with additional terms that do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. In particular, in the disputed domain names, the ARLA mark is combined, depending on the case, with geographical abbreviations ("uk" for the United Kingdom and "gt" for Guatemala), the term "green" (which corresponds to the Complainant's corporate colour), the term "vita" (used by the Complainant in its ARLA VITAKIDS mark), and the term "vip" (a generic term denoting exclusivity or premium status).

At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain names resolved to websites in Spanish and English, displaying the ARLA figurative mark and reproducing photographs of the Complainant, along with extensive content referring to the Complainant, its global operations, management, farmers, and employees. The websites included numerous announcements and sections describing special events organized by the Complainant, corporate communications, projects and news regarding the Complainant's labor contracts and reward programs, together with various other information referring to the Complainant, its activities and use of the ARLA mark. All of the disputed domain names resolved to substantially identical websites, with the exception of <arla-gt.com>, which resolved to a page displaying the ARLA figurative trademark and the message: “Please use your mobile phone to open the download.” Accordingly, the Respondent is not using the disputed domain names in a legitimate noncommercial or fair manner, but to exploit the Complainant’s trademarks and their reputation for its own commercial gain.

As far as registration in bad faith is concerned, the Complainant argues that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names many years after the Complainant's first registration of the ARLA trademark. Moreover, the ARLA trademark is well known. A simple Internet search on the ARLA mark would have enabled the Respondent to learn about the Complainant, its trademarks and business. The structure of the disputed domain names shows that the Respondent registered them having the Complainant and its ARLA mark in mind. This structure reflects the Respondent's intention to create an association with the Complainant's trademark. The Internet users could easily believe that the disputed domain names were directly connected with, or authorized by the Complainant. This conclusion is further reinforced by the fact that shortly after their registration the disputed domain names began resolving to websites referring to the Complainant, including by displaying the ARLA trademark, reproducing detailed corporate information and announcements relating to the Complainant, and presenting content in a manner consistent with official company communications.

Finally, the Complainant notes that the disputed domain names resolve to websites that feature the Complainant's well-known ARLA mark, make unauthorized use of the Complainant's copyrighted materials, particularly the Complainant's photographs, and offer downloadable content to visitors. The Respondent is impersonating the Complainant, while attempting to elicit personal information from Internet users seeking the Complainant and its ARLA mark. Presumably, such users would not disclose this information unless they believed they were dealing with Complainant.

Consequently, the Complainant maintains that by using the disputed domain names in this manner, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its websites or locations or of a product or service on Respondent’s websites or locations.

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 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

I. Confusing Similarity

The Complainant has demonstrated that it holds registered trademark rights in ARLA. All the disputed domain names entirely incorporate this mark , followed by additional elements. In particular, the disputed domain names can be divided into the following groups :

- <arla-uk.com> and <arla-gr.com> consist of the Complainant's mark followed by a hyphen and the two-letter country codes "uk", designating the "United Kingdom", and "gt", designating "Guatemala";
- <arlavita.vip>, <arlavita.online> and <arlavita.com> consist of the Complainant's mark followed by the term "vita", the Italian equivalent of "life", which also forms part of the Complainant's mark ARLA VITAKIDS used in connection with the Complainant's ARLA VITAKIDS products sold in various countries worldwide;
- <arlavitavip.com> consists of the Complainant's mark followed by the terms "vita" and "vip". The term "vip" is a generic term commonly understood to denote exclusivity or premium status. Moreover, it appears that the Complainant is the owner of some domain names incorporating the term "vip" or registered under the new gTLD ".vip";
- <arlagreen.com>, includes the Complainant's mark followed by the term "green", which corresponds to the color used in the ARLA figurative mark and is generally associated with the Complainant's core concepts of naturalness and freshness, sustainability and environmental responsibility, health and well-being.

According to section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“WIPO Overview 3.1”), "[w]here the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element".

As the Complainant's ARLA mark is clearly recognizable within all the disputed domain names, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied the first requirement under the Policy.

II. Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving 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. 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.

In this case, the Complainant maintains that the Respondent was not authorized to reflect its ARLA mark in the disputed domain names. Moreover, the Respondent does not appear to own any trademark corresponding to the disputed domain names, nor to have otherwise been commonly known by them. The nature of the disputed domain names, consisting of the Complainant's ARLA mark followed by one or more terms associated with the Complainant, is such as to impersonate the Complainant or to suggest sponsorship or endorsement by it. The Respondent is using the disputed domain names to resolve to websites featuring the Complainant's ARLA figurative trademark, reproducing photographs on which the Complainant holds copyright, and displaying

various information relating to the Complainant, and its business. The websites also contain a list of questions such as "how to download the "Arla app" on one's IPhone", "how to make money with Arla", "why to pay a fee", etc.

It is therefore clear from the nature of the disputed domain names and the contents of the corresponding websites, that the Respondent is attempting to impersonate the Complainant and to misleadingly divert consumers to its websites for some form of commercial gain. Such use cannot amount to a legitimate or fair use of the disputed domain names, nor does it constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Accordingly, the Panel is satisfied that the second condition under the Policy is met.

III. Bad Faith

Pursuant to Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, in order to succeed in a UDRP proceeding, a complainant must prove, among other elements, that the conflicting domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a non-exhaustive list of circumstances which, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of the domain name in bad faith.

In this case, the Panel notes that the Complainant holds registered rights in the ARLA mark dating back well before the registration of the disputed domain names. The Panel finds that the ARLA mark is distinctive and is closely connected to the Complainant. The disputed domain names wholly incorporate this mark, followed by additional terms that may refer to the Complainant's products, geographical locations, or can otherwise be associated with the Complainant. The websites associated with the disputed domain names also contain multiple references to the Complainant, its figurative mark and copyrighted material. It is therefore clear to the Panel that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with full awareness of the Complainant and of its ARLA mark. The registration of a domain name incorporating a third party's mark without rights or legitimate interests amounts to registration in bad faith.

With regard to use in bad faith, having reviewed all the circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that the Respondent is using the disputed domain names and corresponding websites to impersonate the Complainant and divert Internet traffic for its own commercial gain. The Respondent is inducing Internet users to believe that they can earn money with Arla, while also presenting explanations as to why it is necessary to pay a fee to Arla. Indeed, the websites associated with the disputed domain names include questions such as "how to make money with Arla", "where does my income come from", "how to recharge, and what precautions should be taken when recharging", "how to withdraw money and when", and "why pay this fee". Moreover, the Respondent invites Internet users to download an "Arla app" and provides instructions on how to download it onto their iPhone.

In light of the above, the Panel concludes that the Respondent is using the disputed domain names in bad faith, to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's websites, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's ARLA mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's websites or locations or of a product or service on these websites or locations, within the meaning of Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Finally, the Panel notes that the Respondent clearly provided manifestly false contact information at the time of the registration of the disputed domain names. In particular, both the Respondent's address and city and the Registrant's State/Province consist of meaningless sequences of letters. Moreover, before filing its UDRP Complaint, the Complainant attempted to solve the matter amicably, by sending a takedown notice and subsequent reminder to the hosting provider of the disputed domain names, without receiving any answer. In the Panel's view, these circumstances constitute an additional indication of the Respondent's bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the third and last requirement under the Policy is met.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **arla-uk.com**: Transferred
2. **arlavita.vip**: Transferred
3. **arlavita.online**: Transferred
4. **arlavita.com**: Transferred
5. **arlavitavip.com**: Transferred
6. **arlagreen.com**: Transferred
7. **arla-gt.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Angelica Lodigiani**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-03-04

Publish the Decision