Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108777

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108777
Time of filing	2026-06-25 10:04:17
Domain names	arlavitaglobal.com

Case administrator

Organization	Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Arla Foods Amba

Complainant representative

Organization	Abion GmbH

Respondent

Name	dehua liu

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 several trademarks for Arla (fig.) in several countries among them the European Union Trademark registration 019025606 in classes 1, 5, 29, 30 and 32 registered since September 17, 2024 and in effect.

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 constituted in 2000, when the largest Danish dairy cooperative MD Foods merged with its Swedish counterpart Arla ekonomisk Förening. The Complainant employs around 22000 full time employees and reached a global revenue of EUR 15,1 billion for the year 2025.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 20, 2026 and resolved to a website showing the figurative trademark of the Complainant, photographic material of the Complainant and company announcements.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant, inter alia, contends, that the domain name contains in its entirety Complainant´s mark and the further non distinctive terms „vita“ and „global“ being not sufficient to escape the finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar. The Respondent has no legitimate interest in the domain name in question, since he is not known under the name. By reading the disputed domain name, Internet users may reasonably believe that they are directly connected to, or authorized by the Complainant.

The domain name in question has been both acquired and is being used in bad faith as the Complainant was known already at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name and Complainant´s trademark is used on the website under the disputed domain name.

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).

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).

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).

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 Complainant has established the fact that it has valid trademark rights for „Arla“ for several countries.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the distinctive Arla marks of the Complainant since the addition of the non-distinctive terms „vita“ and „global“ do not prevent a finding of a sufficient confusing similarity.

The Panel therefore considers the domain name to be confusingly similar to the trademark „Arla“, in which the Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Respondent has no rights in the disputed domain name since the Respondent did not explain that he was authorised by the Complainant to use its trademarks. Furthermore, the Respondent has no legitimate interest in the domain name since there is no indication that the Respondent is commonly known by the name “Arla” or „arlavitaglobal.com“ nor that the Respondent is using the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of related goods or services.

The Panel therefore finds that the respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the domain name.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

In view of the size of the Complainant and the full incorporation of the trademark of the complainant, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its trademarks when registering the disputed domain name.

The circumstances of this case, in particular the use of Complainant´s trademark on website under the disputed domain indicate that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name primarily with the intention of attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its potential website or other online locations, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of such website or location, or of a product or service on such website or location. The Panel therefore considers the disputed domain name to have been registered and used in bad faith in accordance with 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. **arlavitaglobal.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Dietrich Beier**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-07-23

Publish the Decision