Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108375

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108375
Time of filing	2026-02-03 10:17:37
Domain names	florafoodgroups.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Flora Food Group B.V.

Complainant representative

Organization	Stobbs IP Limited

Respondent

Name	Angeles Rodriguez

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 company Flora Food Global Principal B.V. owns the following trademarks:

(a) EU trademark FLORA, reg. no. 018200053, registered on 26 March 2021 in class 29;

(b) US trademark FLORA, reg. no. 88230796, registered on 28 June 2022 in class 29;

(c) International trademark FLORA, reg. no. 1449945, registered on 15 November 2018 in classes 5, 29, 30, 35 and 43;

(d) EU trademark FLORA Food Group, reg. no. 019082702, registered on 29 June 2025 in classes 5, 29, 30, 35 and 43; and

(e) International trademark FLORA Food Group, reg. no. 1834306, registered on 23 September 2024 in classes 5, 29, 30, 35 and 43.

("**Trademarks**")

The company Flora Food Global Principal B.V. (through its attorneys Stobbs (IP) Limited) authorized the Complainant to enforce its rights to the Trademarks and therefore the Complainant established its standing in these proceedings.

The disputed domain name was registered on 24 July 2025.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

As the Respondent did not file any response to the complaint, the Panel took into account the following facts asserted by the Complainant (and supported by the documentary evidence submitted by the Complainant) and unchallenged by the Respondent:

(a) The Complainant is a global leader in the sourcing, production, and sale of plant-based consumer products, with a heritage stretching back to 1871 as the original dairy alternative company. The Complainant's business can be traced back to 2018, when it spun off from British multinational consumer goods company Unilever. The business continued to grow significantly through the years, when in December 2017, the business was sold and relaunched as Upfield, and was then further rebranded as Flora under Flora Food Group B.V. The Complainant currently employs more than 4,200 employees globally and has sold more than $1 billion worth of products promoting health benefits, through seven far-reaching brands, such as Flora, Violife, Becel, and Rama. The Complainant continues to hold a leading position in the global margarine market, with more than 50% share of the margarine markets in Germany, the Netherlands, the U.K., the U.S, and 40 other markets.

(b) The Complainant is authorized to enforce the rights in the Trademarks;

(c) The Complainant's official website can be found at florafoodgroup.com; and

(d) The disputed domain name previously resolved to a live website which featured the Complainant's FLORA branding, while copying most of the Complainant's official website. This is indicative of a website set up with the purpose of impersonating the Complainant. The website is currently inactive after the Complainant submitted a complaint to the registrar and email services provider Namecheap.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

THE COMPLAINANT:

In addition to the above factual assertions, the Complainant also contends the following:

(i) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademarks because it incorporates (a) the distinctive element of Flora Trademarks and (b) the Flora Food Group Trademarks almost entirely with just a slight spelling variation by the addition of the letter "s" at the end. Such slight spelling variation and/or inclusion of descriptive terms such as "Food" and "Group" does not diminish the likelihood of confusion;

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. There is no affiliation, license, or authorization between the parties, and the Respondent has never been authorized to use the Trademarks. Additionally, there is no evidence of a bona fide offering of goods or services or any legitimate non-commercial use of the disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith. The Respondent has clearly been using the disputed domain name, which is confusingly similar to the Trademarks, for the operation of a website similar to an official website of the Complainant in order to attract the Complainant's customers to the Respondent's website. When such a website was active, the Respondent was clearly impersonating the Complainant, and not offering any legitimate goods and/or services. Therefore, it is inferred that the Respondent had full knowledge of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration.

For these reasons, the Complainant seeks transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

THE RESPONDENT:

The Respondent did not provide any response to the complaint.

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 Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy ("**UDRP**" or "**Policy**").

For details, please see "Principal Reasons for the Decision".

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).

For details, please see "Principal Reasons for the Decision".

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).

For details, please see "Principal Reasons for the Decision".

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

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainant proves each of the following three elements to obtain an order that the disputed domain name should be transferred or revoked:

(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 in respect of the disputed domain name; and

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

The Panel will proceed to analyze whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied in these proceedings.

RIGHTS

The disputed domain name includes the distinctive word element of the Trademarks "FLORA" in its entirety and therefore is confusingly similar to Complainant's FLORA Trademarks. Furthermore, the disputed domain name also includes the FLORA FOOD GROUP Trademarks with a mere addition of the letter "s" at the end. Such a slight spelling variation certainly does not diminish such confusing similarity.

For the sake of completeness, the Panel asserts that the top-level suffix in the domain name (i.e. the ".com") must be disregarded under the identity / confusing similarity test as it is a necessary technical requirement of registration.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Complainant satisfied the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. Once such a prima facie case is made, the Respondent carries the burden of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the Respondent fails to do so, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP (please see, for example, WIPO case no. D2003-0455, Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.).

The disputed domain name resolved to a website clearly copying the official website of the Complainant in an attempt to mislead Internet users into believing that the website under the disputed domain name is the official website of the Complainant or is somehow associated with the Complainant. Such conduct of the Respondent certainly cannot establish the Respondent's right or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name. Furthermore, as asserted by the Complainant (and unchallenged by the Respondent), the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. Neither is the Respondent in any way related to the Complainant. The Respondent failed to provide any information and evidence that it has relevant rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) (ii) of the Policy).

Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Respondent does not have any right or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has not presented evidence establishing any of the typical cases of bad faith in registration and use of the domain names listed in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy. Nevertheless, such a list is not exhaustive, and bad faith in registration and use of the

disputed domain name may also be found in other cases, taking into account all relevant facts and circumstances of the case at hand (please see the WIPO case No. D2000-0003, Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows <telstra.org> and WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Second Edition, Section 3.2).

Here, the Panel noted that the Complainant is a global leader in the sourcing, production, and sale of plant-based consumer products and the Trademarks enjoy a good reputation. Hence, the Panel is convinced that the denominations FLORA and FLORA FOOD GROUP are clearly distinctive to the Complainant and its group and the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in full knowledge of the Complainant and the Trademarks. Otherwise, the Respondent would not have operated a website under the disputed domain name which was clearly copied the official website of the Complainant. In this respect, the Panel also deems it appropriate to refer to paragraph 2 of the Policy under which it is the responsibility of the Respondent as the registrant of the disputed domain name to determine whether its registration infringes or violates someone else's rights.

In light of the above circumstances, the Panel failed to find any plausible good faith reasons for registration and use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent. The Respondent has not submitted any response to the Complaint and therefore has not presented any facts or arguments that could counter the above conclusions of the Panel. As a result, the Panel holds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used by the Respondent in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **florafoodgroups.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Michal Matějka**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-03-12

Publish the Decision