

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108802

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108802
Time of filing	2026-07-03 10:15:42
Domain names	arlafoodslimited.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Arla Foods Amba
--------------	-----------------

Complainant representative

Organization	Abion GmbH
--------------	------------

Respondent

Name	mia sanchez
------	-------------

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 **ARLA** and **ARLA FOODS**, such as but not limited to:

- Swedish trademark registration **ARLA** 165607, registered on December 1, 1978;
- US trademark registration **ARLA** 3325019, registered on October 30, 2007;
- US trademark registration **ARLA** 3651489, registered on July 7, 2009;
- EU trademark registration **ARLA** No. 019025606, registered on September 17, 2024;
- International trademark registration **ARLA** 731917, registered on 20 March 20, 2000;
- International trademark registration **ARLA FOODS** 1829124, registered on October 2, 2024.

The Complainant has made significant investment to promote its famous brands **ARLA**, **LURPAK**, **CASTELLO**, **APETINA** and others. The Complainant enjoys a strong presence globally. Due to extensive use, advertising and revenue associated with its trademarks worldwide, the Complainant enjoys a high degree of renown around the world. Previous UDRP panels have stated that the **ARLA** trademark is well-known.

The Complainant also owns numerous domain names containing its trademarks, including **<arla.com>** (registered July 15, 1996), **<arlafoodsgroup.com>** (registered October 20, 2025), **<arlafoods-group.com>** (registered February 5, 2021), **<arlafoods.com>** (registered October 1, 1999), **<arlafoods.ca>** (registered November 29, 2000). These domain names resolve to its official websites, through which it informs Internet users and potential consumers about its **ARLA** and **ARLA FOODS** trademarks and related products and services.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, Arla Foods 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 22,052 full time employees and reached a global revenue of EUR 15.1 billion for the year 2025.

The Complainant also operates in the United Kingdom through ARLA FOODS LIMITED, a UK company registered under company number 02143253, with its registered office at Arla House, 4 Savannah Way, Leeds Valley Park, Leeds Yorkshire, LS10 1AB, United Kingdom.

The Complainant has a business presence in the United Arab Emirates, where the Respondent is based. Arla Foods Middle East, a wholly owned subsidiary of the Complainant, has operated in the region for over 60 years. The Complainant's presence in the Middle East has developed from traditional exports to local representation, regional production, distribution, partnerships, and the establishment of a regional office for the Middle East and Africa in Dubai, United Arab Emirates.

The Complainant's main corporate website at <https://www.arla.com/>.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 25, 2026. On June 26, 2026, the Complainant through its legal representative made a successful takedown request concerning the site attached to the disputed domain name for impersonating the Complainant and for being used in connection with fraudulent invoice requests.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

Complainant

The Complainant's contentions can be summarised as follows:

(i) The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

The Complainant owns numerous ARLA and ARLA FOODS trademarks registered many years before the disputed domain name was registered.

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 "limited". The term "limited" directly refers to a corporate form and, in the context of the disputed domain name, reinforces the misleading impression that the disputed domain name refers to, or is operated by the Complainant. The term "limited" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The Complainant's ARLA and ARLA FOODS trademarks remain clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. UDRP Panels have consistently held that the addition of a descriptive or generic term to a complainant's trademark does not prevent the finding of confusing similarity.

The presence of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") extension ".com" in the first-level portion of the disputed domain name is a standard registration requirement and may be disregarded when assessing whether the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's ARLA and ARLA FOODS trademarks, as it incorporates the ARLA and ARLA FOODS trademarks in their entirety and merely add a generic, descriptive, or non-distinctive element ("limited") that does not prevent confusing similarity with the Complainant's trademarks.

(ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name;

The Complainant has never granted the Respondent any rights to use the ARLA and ARLA FOODS trademarks in any form, including in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent's name "mia sanchez" does not correspond to the disputed domain name.

There is no evidence that the Respondent is known by the disputed domain name or owns any corresponding registered trademark, including the terms "arlafoodslimited.com", "arlafoodslimited" and "arla foods limited". No exact matches are found in relation to trademarks corresponding to the aforementioned terms.

The Respondent could have easily performed a similar search before registering the disputed domain name and would have quickly learnt that the trademarks are owned by the Complainant and that the Complainant has been using the trademarks for their business activities. However, the Respondent still chose to register the disputed domain name as such.

Moreover, the structure of the disputed domain name – incorporating in its second-level portion the Complainant's ARLA and ARLA FOODS trademarks together with the term "limited" – directly refers to the Complainant and its UK corporate presence, ARLA FOODS LIMITED. The use of the corporate term "limited" is particularly misleading in this context, as it creates the false impression that the

disputed domain name is operated by, or otherwise formally connected with, the Complainant's UK entity. UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner.

The Respondent has not been using, or preparing to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services, nor making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Rather, the disputed domain name has been used as part of a fraudulent phishing scheme impersonating the Complainant. Such use can never confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent. Previous UDRP panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, including phishing, impersonation or other forms of fraud, cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

For the foregoing reasons, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, within the meaning of Paragraphs 4(a)(ii) and (4)(c) of the Policy.

(iii) The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

a. Registration of the disputed domain name in bad faith

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name many years after the first registration of the Complainant's ARLA and ARLA FOODS trademarks. Moreover, the ARLA trademark is well known, as previously held by UDRP Panels and is registered in many countries. The Complainant also enjoys a strong online presence and is very active on social media platforms to promote its trademark and products.

By conducting a simple online search regarding the disputed domain name terms "arlafoodslimited.com", "arlafoodslimited" and "arla foods limited" in search engines, such as Google, the Respondent would have inevitably learnt about the Complainant, its trademarks and business.

As previously mentioned, the structure of the disputed domain name – incorporating in its second-level portion the Complainant's ARLA and ARLA FOODS trademarks together with a term "limited" – 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, shortly after its registration, the disputed domain name was used in connection with an impersonation and phishing scheme.

In view of the above facts, the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

b. Use of the disputed domain name in bad faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy identifies, in particular but without limitation, four circumstances which shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith. Among those circumstances Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy reads: "by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product or service on your website or location."

The Respondent used the disputed domain name as part of a phishing scheme designed to impersonate the Complainant. Such conduct demonstrates that the Respondent used the disputed domain name for phishing and impersonation, aimed at exploiting the Complainant's reputation.

The Respondent's conduct falls squarely within the type of bad faith use contemplated by paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. By using a domain name that incorporates the Complainant's ARLA and ARLA FOODS trademarks, together with the corporate term "limited", the Respondent created a false impression of affiliation with the Complainant and its UK corporate presence. The purpose of such use was to mislead Internet users and recipients of fraudulent communications into believing that they were dealing with the Complainant or an authorised entity within its corporate group.

The fraudulent nature of the Respondent's use is further supported by the fact that, following the takedown request submitted by the Complainant, the Registrar confirmed safe receipt of the request and the disputed domain name has since been placed on client hold. This indicates that the Registrar's intervention appears to have been successful in blocking the active use of the disputed domain name.

The fact that the disputed domain name is currently inactive does not prevent a finding of bad faith use. Rather, the current inactivity appears to be the result of the Registrar's remedial action following the Complainant's takedown request. In any event, previous active use of the disputed domain name for impersonation and phishing is sufficient to establish bad faith use under the Policy.

In light of the above, the Panel should find that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith, and its conduct falls within the meaning of Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Respondent

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 disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's prior well-known trade mark ARLA FOODS, adding only the generic word 'limited' and the gTLD .com, which do not prevent said confusing similarity, both being generic.

The Complainant did not actually file evidence of the disputed domain name being used for fraud. However, the Panel finds that there is a high risk of affiliation between the disputed domain name and the Complainant and the companies in its group particularly its UK subsidiary Arla Foods Limited, and the disputed domain name itself appears to be inherently confusing and an instrument of fraud as on its face it appears to be affiliated with that company because apart from the gTLD .com it reflects the exact and exclusive name of that company.

The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and is not authorised by the Complainant. It has not rebutted the prima facie case evidenced by the Complainant. There is no credible explanation for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name which reflects the Complainant's well-known mark and the exact name of its UK subsidiary and therefore appears to be a case of impersonation on its face.

The disputed domain name is not attached to an active website and there does not appear to be any evidence of a bona fide

offering of goods or services or a non-commercial legitimate or fair use.

Currently, the Respondent is passively holding the disputed domain name, and this does not prevent a finding of registration and use in bad faith. The Complainant's mark is well known, and the use of the exact name of the Complainant's subsidiary in the disputed domain name is tantamount to impersonation on its face, proves the Respondent had knowledge of the Complainant and its business and was targeting the Complainant and/or its group of companies.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

- 1. arlafoodslimited.com: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Dawn Osborne
------	--------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-08-12

Publish the Decision