

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108808

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108808
Time of filing	2026-07-07 10:16:15
Domain names	adobeoriginal.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Dvořáková (Case admin)
------	-----------------------------

Complainant

Organization	Adobe Inc.
--------------	------------

Complainant representative

Organization	Convey srl
--------------	------------

Respondent

Name	Bima Satria
------	-------------

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 is the registered owner of a large portfolio of marks consisting of or containing the sign ADOBE. In particular, the Complaint is based on the following trademarks:

1. **ADOBE** (verbal) - EUTM Reg. no. 009595356 filed on December 14, 2010 and registered on May 03, 2011 for goods/services in classes 9, 35, 42;
2. **ADOBE** - US reg. no. 1475793 filed on June 23, 1987 and registered on February 09, 1988 for goods in class 9.

According to the trademark extracts on record, these marks have duly been renewed and are in force.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

According to the Complainant's documented allegations, which remained uncontested, it is a leading global technology company specializing in the development of software and digital media solutions, which was established in 1982. It offers a comprehensive portfolio of industry-standard applications, including, inter alia, Adobe Photoshop, Adobe Illustrator, Adobe Premiere Pro, Adobe After Effects and Adobe InDesign.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on August 11, 2023. It currently resolves to a website promoting original Adobe products by referencing the Complainant's "ADOBE" trademarks without the Complainant's consent.

On June 18, 2026 Complainant notified the Respondent through its representatives of the infringement of its trademark rights, formally requesting the immediate cessation of the unauthorized use and the transfer of the disputed domain name. No response has been received so far.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

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

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

1.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainants have rights.

It results from the evidence provided, that the Complainant is the registered owner of several trademarks worldwide for "ADOBE", as listed above.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the trademark is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name and the latter is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Edition 3.1 ("WIPO Overview 3.1") at section 1.7).

Although the addition of another term here, "original", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy, WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

2.

In the absence of any Response, or any other information from the Respondent indicating the contrary, the Panel holds that the Complainant has successfully presented its prima facie case and that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

There is no evidence in the record or in the Whois information showing that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, in the sense of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

Nor can the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i), or to a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c)(iii). The disputed domain name resolves to a website purportedly offering ADOBE products and prominently displaying the Complainant's ADOBE trademark, yet the Complainant has no relationship with the Respondent and has not authorized this use, including the registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's distinctive ADOBE trademark in its entirety, a term unlikely to have been chosen other than to suggest an affiliation with the Complainant, and the absence of any disclaimer on the resolving website only reinforces the false impression that it is operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant. Such impersonating commercial use excludes any bona fide, noncommercial, or fair use of the disputed domain name from the outset.

It is well established that once a complainant makes out a prima facie case, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to come forward with evidence of rights or legitimate interests (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1). Since the Respondent has failed to do so, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy is satisfied.

3.

Finally, the Respondent, by using the disputed domain name, has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website, or of the products offered thereon (paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy).

It results from the documented and undisputed evidence provided by the Complainant that the disputed domain name resolves to a website purportedly offering ADOBE products, prominently displaying the Complainant's ADOBE trademark. The Panel therefore finds it inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights when registering the disputed domain name. For the Panel, it is rather evident that the Respondent positively knew the Complainant's trademarks and products, and consequently, and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the Panel is convinced that the Respondent also knew that the disputed domain name included the Complainant's ADOBE trademark in its entirety when it registered the disputed domain name. Registration of a domain name which contains a third party's trademark, in awareness of that trademark and in the absence of rights or legitimate interests, is suggestive of registration in bad faith.

The inclusion of the term "original" in the disputed domain name, and its repeated use throughout the resolving website (including references to "Adobe Original Indonesia" and the claim that the offered products are "original and legal" because the Respondent "get[s] the license from Adobe" with an "activation confirmation email directly from Adobe"), reasonably suggests that the Respondent intentionally sought, from the outset, to exploit the Complainant's trademarks and reputation for illicit commercial gain by creating the false impression that the website is operated, authorized, or otherwise affiliated with the Complainant and offers genuine Adobe products. While the ability to actually purchase the goods is not known to the Panel, the alleged commercial offering and impersonation of the Complainant, reinforced by extensive and unauthorized references to the Complainant's software portfolio and Creative Cloud services, is sufficient to establish the Respondent's bad-faith intent to mislead Internet users for commercial gain.

Beyond these circumstances exposed above, the Panel considers the following circumstances surrounding the registration of the disputed domain name, as suggesting that the Respondent was aware that it has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith:

- the reputation of the trademark ADOBE (in the software sector), which is fully and identically incorporated in the disputed domain name;
- the Respondent's failure to submit a formal response;
- the Respondent's failure to reply when the Complainant sought to engage it directly in an effort to pursue an amicable resolution;
- the Respondent's failure to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use;
- the implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **adobeoriginal.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name Tobias Malte Müller

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-08-24

Publish the Decision