Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108604

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108604
Time of filing	2026-04-29 09:43:02
Domain names	ikea-shop-online.net, ikea-online-shop.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Inter IKEA Systems B.V.

Complainant representative

Organization	Convey srl

Respondent

Name	Bo SOULIYA

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 multiple registered trademarks for the mark IKEA including, for example:

German Registered Trademark Number DE867152, registered on March 12, 1970;

United States of America Registered Trademark Number 1118706, registered on May 22, 1979;

European Union Registered Trademark Number 000109652, registered on October 1, 1998; and

Laos Registered Trademark Number 51668, registered on August 25, 2021.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

FACTS ASSERTED BY THE COMPLAINANT AND NOT CONTESTED BY THE RESPONDENT:

Founded in 1943, the Complainant is a well-known Swedish home furnishing company, with more than four hundred stores. The Complainant's corporate group employs approximately 222,000 people worldwide, operating in over fifty markets and attracting

nearly one billion visitors per year. The use of the Complainant's IKEA mark began more than 70 years ago. The Complainant holds trademark registrations in more than 80 countries around the world and has extensively promoted its brand. The Complainant's website at "www.ikea.com" was launched in 1997. The Complainant holds over 700 domain names representing or corresponding to its IKEA mark.

The Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain names as follows:

The disputed domain name <ikea-shop-online.net> was registered on February 10, 2026 and the associated website is hosting IKEA related content, passing itself off as the official website of the Complainant.

The disputed domain name <ikea-online-shop.com> was also registered on February 10, 2026 and the associated website is also hosting IKEA related content and is also passing itself off as the official website of the Complainant.

The Complainant issued Cease and Desist letters to the Respondent in respect of each of the disputed domain names on March 19, 2026 but the Respondent did not reply to either of these.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

Complainant:

The Complainant requests consolidation of claims concerning the disputed domain names into a single proceeding. The registrar's verification of the details of the disputed domain names indicates that they were registered by the same registrant and they share a similar technical configuration, and an identical date 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.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain names reproduce the Complainant's IKEA mark in its entirety with the addition of various descriptive terms, rendering them confusingly similar to the said mark.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not an authorized dealer of the Complainant and is not otherwise authorized to use the Complainant's IKEA mark in the disputed domain names, adding that the said mark is inherently distinctive and only refers to the Complainant. The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain names were registered to trade upon the reputation of the said mark because they were each connected to websites that were hosting IKEA related content and were passing themselves off as the official websites of the Complainant when they are not. The Complainant states that there is no evidence that the Respondent could fulfil any aspect of paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

The Complainant submits that in view of the distinctiveness and well-known character of the Complainant's IKEA mark, it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of its existence at the time of the registration of the disputed domain names, which are confusingly similar thereto, adding that the Respondent has not provided evidence of contemplated good faith use of the disputed domain names and is demonstrably capitalizing on the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant's marks and misleading Internet users. The Complainant also notes that the contact information provided by the Respondent to the registrar for both of the disputed domain names is manifestly inaccurate and incomplete, whereby it is not possible to identify or verify the existing address on the basis of the data supplied.

Respondent:

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

As a preliminary matter, the Panel notes that it is not strictly necessary for the Complainant to request consolidation of its Complaints here, although it has chosen to make such a request, because the case involves two disputed domain names registered by the same Respondent (according to the registrar-verified data). Consequently, the case does not involve multiple respondents whereby the Panel would typically expect to receive submissions regarding whether the corresponding websites are subject to common control and whether consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties (on this particular topic, see the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.11.2. The said websites are de facto under common control because the same Respondent is the registrant of each of the corresponding disputed domain names. The case therefore proceeds as normal in respect of a single Complaint against a single Respondent in respect of two disputed domain names.

With regard to the first element of the Policy, the Complainant has demonstrated to the Panel's satisfaction that it has UDRP-relevant rights in its IKEA trademark by virtue of the registered trademarks noted above.

The disputed domain names consist of the said mark as their first element, immediately followed by the terms "-shop-online" and "-online-shop" respectively. The addition of these descriptive dictionary words to the Complainant's distinctive trademark is insufficient to avoid a finding of confusing similarity under the Policy. The domain name suffix in each case can be disregarded for the purposes of the comparison (see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1). Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's IKEA trademark.

With regard to the second element of the Policy, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not an authorized dealer of the Complainant and is not otherwise authorized to use the Complainant's IKEA mark in the disputed domain names, that the said mark is inherently distinctive and only refers to the Complainant, and that the disputed domain names were registered to trade upon the reputation of the said mark because they were each connected to websites that were hosting IKEA-related content and were passing themselves off as the official websites of the Complainant when they are not. This is sufficient, in the Panel's view, to give rise to the requisite prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

The Panel notes from the websites associated with the disputed domain names that the Respondent may appear to be offering the Complainant's goods for sale. Section 2.8.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1 notes that panels have recognized that resellers using a domain name containing the complainant's trademark to undertake sales related to the complainant's goods or services may be making a bona fide offering of goods and services and thus have a legitimate interest in such domain name. Outlined in the "Oki Data test", the following cumulative requirements will be applied in the specific conditions of a UDRP case:

(i) the respondent must actually be offering the goods or services at issue;

(ii) the respondent must use the site to sell only the trademarked goods or services;

(iii) the site must accurately and prominently disclose the registrant's relationship with the trademark holder; and

(iv) the respondent must not try to "corner the market" in domain names that reflect the trademark.

In the case at hand, the Panel notes that the websites associated with the disputed domain names fail the test according to at least item (iii) above. The said websites bear to be official sites of the Complainant when they are not. This could not on any view confer rights or legitimate interests upon the Respondent in respect of either of the disputed domain names.

There is no evidence before the Panel on the present record suggesting that the Respondent could fulfil any of the aspects of paragraph 4(c) of the Policy or otherwise establish rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

The Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's allegations and evidence in this case and has failed to set out any alleged rights or legitimate interests which it might have claimed in the disputed domain names. Notably, the Respondent has not suggested that it is selling genuine products of the Complainant. The content of the websites associated with the disputed domain names (and the composition of the disputed domain names themselves) suggests that the Respondent is impersonating the Complainant. The Respondent has not shown any way in which it might be alerting consumers to the fact that it is not the Complainant. There are no submissions or evidence on the record that might serve to rebut the Complainant's case on this topic, as outlined above. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

The Panel considers that there are circumstances suggesting that the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith. The appropriate date for registration in bad faith is the date of registration of the disputed domain names (see

WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.9). By that date, the Complainant's trademark registrations were well-known and long-established, in fact, for many decades. The Respondent deliberately references the Complainant's mark and branding on the websites associated with the disputed domain names in a manner which impersonates the Complainant and presents each website as the Complainant's official website. No effort is taken by the Respondent to draw a clear line between itself and the Complainant. Notably, the Complainant's trademark is reproduced prominently at the top of each of the websites associated with the disputed domain names in the Complainant's typical livery without there being any clear explanation of the lack of relationship between the Parties. The composition of the disputed domain names implies such a relationship.

The Panel finds it to be reasonable, in these circumstances and in the absence of any countervailing submissions or evidence, to infer that the disputed domain names were registered by the Respondent with an awareness of the Complainant and its rights, and with an intent to target these unfairly. In terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, 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 source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of such websites.

Consequently, the Panel considers that the Complainant has made out a sufficient case of registration and use of both of the disputed domain names in bad faith within the meaning of the Policy. The Respondent has not filed a Response in this case and therefore has not sought to address the Complainant's allegations of bad faith registration and use or to address in any way the evidence that the Complainant has brought forward. The Respondent has not offered any explanation that might have suggested that its actions regarding the disputed domain names were in good faith, and the Panel has been unable to identify any conceivable good faith explanation which the Respondent might have given in this case. In all of these circumstances, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used 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.net**: Transferred
2. **ikea-online-shop.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Andrew Lothian**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-05-27

Publish the Decision