

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108874

Case number CAC-UDRP-108874

Time of filing 2026-07-29 13:18:36

Domain names arlafoods.cam

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization Arla Foods Amba

Complainant representative

Organization Abion GmbH

Respondent

Organization Jennings plastic manufacturing

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 owner of a portfolio of registered trademark rights in ARLA FOODS and ARLA, including:

- Danish Trademark Registration No. VR 2000 01185 for ARLA FOODS, registered on March 6, 2000;
- Danish Trademark Registration No. VR 2024 01674 for ARLA FOODS, registered on November 18, 2024; and
- International Trademark Registration No. 1829124 for ARLA FOODS, registered on October 2, 2024.

The Complainant also owns and operates various domain names incorporating its trade marks, including <arla.com>, registered on July 15, 1996, <arlafoods.com>, registered on October 1, 1999, and <arlafoods.de>, registered on October 5, 1999, which resolve to the Complainant's official websites.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, Arla Foods Amba, is a dairy cooperative based in Denmark and one of the world's largest dairy companies. It markets and sells dairy products worldwide under brands including ARLA, LURPAK, CASTELLO, and APETINA.

The disputed domain name <arlafoods.cam> was registered on May 15, 2026. At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a parked webpage displaying pay-per-click ("PPC") links including: "Buy Arla Foods Online", "Online

Supermarket Deals", "Wholesale Dairy Product Suppliers", "Arla Foods", "Arla Recept", and "Express Dairies".

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 similar to a trade mark 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

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy requires a complainant to show that a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights.

The Complainant has provided evidence that it owns registered trademark rights in the ARLA FOODS mark.

In this case, the disputed domain name <arlafoods.cam> reproduces the Complainant's ARLA FOODS trade mark in its entirety, omitting only the space between "ARLA" and "FOODS", which cannot be represented in a domain name. The Complainant's trade mark therefore remains clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name.

As for the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".cam", it is well established that the gTLD is not relevant to the issue of identity or confusing similarity between the Complainant's trademark and the domain name in dispute (see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1).

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's ARLA FOODS trade mark, and is strikingly similar to the Complainant's <arlafoods.com> domain name. This creates a likelihood of confusion among Internet users and those who misread the gTLD or mistype it, would be led to the Respondent's parking page.

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Complainant has shown that the disputed domain name is identical to a trade mark in which the Complainant has rights.

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Once the complainant establishes a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the domain name, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to show that it has rights or legitimate interests in respect to the domain name (see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1).

In the present case, the Complainant has demonstrated a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and the Respondent has failed to assert any such rights or legitimate interests.

The Complainant has provided evidence that it has been the registered owner of the ARLA FOODS mark long before the date that the disputed domain name was registered. It has not authorised or licensed the Respondent to use the Complainant's trade mark. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Further, the disputed domain name resolves to a parked webpage displaying PPC links including "Buy Arla Foods Online", "Wholesale Dairy Product Suppliers", and "Arla Foods", which refer directly to the Complainant and/or its field of business. Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Panels have found that the use of a domain name to host a parked page comprising PPC links does not represent a bona fide offering where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant's mark or otherwise mislead Internet users. (See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.9). The composition of the disputed domain name, consisting entirely of the Complainant's ARLA FOODS mark, also carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant (see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1).

The Respondent did not submit a Response and did not provide any explanation for its choice of the disputed domain name nor evidence to show rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name which would be sufficient to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant must also show that the respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith (see Policy, paragraph 4(a)(iii)). Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides circumstances that may evidence bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

The Complainant's ARLA FOODS trade mark was registered many years before the registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name reproduces the ARLA FOODS mark in its entirety and differs from the Complainant's official domain name <arlafoods.com> only in the gTLD, using ".cam" instead of ".com".

The Panel is persuaded that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its ARLA FOODS trade mark at the time of registering the disputed domain name, and that the disputed domain name was registered with the Complainant's mark in mind. This conclusion is reinforced by the content of the parked webpage, which includes PPC links expressly referring to "Arla Foods" and "Buy Arla Foods Online", as well as links concerning dairy products and food markets. These links demonstrate that the disputed domain name has been used to target the Complainant and its business, and profit off the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant's ARLA and ARLA FOODS marks, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's ARLA FOODS trade mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. Such circumstances fall within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Accordingly, having regard to the circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that the Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy has been established.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

- 1. arlafoods.cam: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Francine Tan
------	--------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-08-28

Publish the Decision

