Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-109065

Case number	CAC-UDRP-109065
Time of filing	2026-10-16 11:07:48
Domain names	ikeabrands.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Inter IKEA Systems B.V

Complainant representative

Organization	Convey srl

Respondent

Name	homegoo dsstore

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

Complainant is the owner, among others, of the following registrations for the IKEA trademark (word mark or word + device mark):

- German Trademark Registration n. DE867152 of March 12, 1970, in class 20;
- U.S.A. Trademark Registration n. 1118706 of May 22, 1979, in classes 11, 20, 21, 24, 27;
- European Union Trademark Registration n. 000109652 of October 1, 1998, in classes 2, 8, 11, 16, 18, 20, 21, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 35, 36, 39, 41, 42;
- European Union Trademark Registration n. 000109637 of October 8, 1998, in classes 2, 8, 11, 16, 18, 20, 21, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 35, 26, 39, 41, 42;
- International Trademark Registration n. 926155 of April 24, 2007, in class 16, 20, 35, 43, designating many countries including China;
- China Trademark Registration n. 175290, in class 24;
- China Trademark Registration n. 175291, in class 20;
- China Trademark Registration n. 684739, in class 18;
- China Trademark Registration n. 684921, in class 25.

Complainant has submitted evidence of the above mentioned registrations, being print-outs of the online databases of the relevant trademark registers. However, the Panel will not take into account the Chinese trademarks as the print-outs are in Chinese, which is

not the language of this UDRP Procedure.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Complainant, Inter IKEA Systems B.V with domicile Delft in The Netherlands, (hereafter: IKEA) is the worldwide IKEA franchisor and responsible for developing and supplying the global IKEA range.

IKEA is one of the most well-known home furnishing brands in the world, with more than four hundred stores, whilst the IKEA Group in total has roughly 222,000 employees worldwide. The Group reaches more than fifty markets and welcomes almost a billion visitors per year. This information is substantiated by a printout from the IKEA website.

IKEA history

IKEA was founded in Älmhult, a small Swedish village in the countryside, by Ingvar Kamprad, aiming to sell household goods and furniture at low prices in 1943. Because the town is in a rather remote area of Sweden, it was difficult to reach potential customers in the bigger cities. Consequently, the IKEA catalogue was born in 1951 and it was published until a few years ago. Now it is replaced by IKEA brochures. Further, due to the difficulty and expensiveness of mail order distribution of bulky furniture, Complainant introduced self-assembly and flat packing in 1956.

The international expansion of the IKEA business began with the establishment of small start-up stores in Norway in 1963 and in Denmark in 1969. Then, in 1973 the first IKEA store outside Scandinavia was established in Switzerland, followed by stores in Germany.

In the 1980s, IKEA expanded noticeably into new markets such as the USA, Italy, France and the UK.

IKEA loyalty card

In the same period, the loyalty card “IKEA family” was launched. Nowadays, the cards are available worldwide, free of charge, and can be used to obtain discounts on certain products.

IKEA Foundation

Besides the furniture production, IKEA supports many social projects under the name the IKEA Foundation:

- American Forests to restore forests and reduce pollution;
- Several international charitable causes, particularly in partnership with UNICEF;
- It aims to improve opportunities for children and youth in some of the world’s poorest communities by focusing on four fundamental areas of a child’s life: a place to call home; a healthy start in life; a quality education; and a sustainable family income.
- IKEA is also helping these communities fight and cope with climate change;
- IKEA Foundation helps fight the root causes of child labour in Pakistan: in partnership with Save the Children and UNICEF it has given over 176,000 children direct access to projects aimed at preventing child labour. By focusing on Pakistan’s cotton-growing areas, the partnership helps fight the root causes of child labour in Pakistan’s cotton industry, with the aim of preventing children from working in the cotton, metalware and carpet industries.

IKEA museum

Complainant also possesses a museum.

It was opened in 2016 in the first IKEA store in Älmhult, Sweden. It comprises 7,000 m², including an exhibition area of approximately 3,500 m², as well as a restaurant, gift shop and educational facilities.

IKEA brand

IKEA is named after the initials of founder Ingvar Kamprad, Elmtaryd, the farm on which he grew up, and Agunnaryd, the nearby village.

Therefore, this acronym has no meaning and is completely original and creative, as Complainant states.

The use of the mark started more than 70 years ago and has been renowned for its business services and brand recognition. According to Best Global Brands of Interbrand, in 2025 the brand IKEA is ranked in the thirty-five position. A screen shot of the website of www.interbrands.com substantiates this.

Furthermore, as Complainant alleges, Complainant holds trademark registrations in more than 80 countries around the world, and the IKEA trademark has been extensively promoted, without limitation, in print advertisements, promotional materials, Internet forums acquiring high international recognition.

The IKEA website www.ikea.com was launched in 1997 and nowadays Complainant has registered more than 441 domain names under generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") and 294 domain names under country code Top-Level Domains ("ccTLDs").

The trademark IKEA has been extensively used in the major social networks where Complainant has multiple accounts on the same platform for each country.

Always keen to try the latest technological trends, Complainant has recently launched the augmented reality and IKEA Place app to provide a composite view and to help customers to imagine how the furniture will look and fit in their homes. A print screen of the IKEA website confirming this development is enclosed to the Complaint.

In view of the wide use, the trademark IKEA is distinctive and well known all around the world, as Complainant concludes.

The disputed domain name

The disputed domain name resolves into a website that comprises IKEA related content. As shown in the print outs of the website belonging to the disputed domain name the IKEA trademark is depicted in the top left corner, followed by the wording 'IKEA furniture – bedroom, kitchen, living room & home décor' with photos of different types of furniture. Moreover, a frame with explanation of the creation of the IKEA brand is depicted. Also, the website explains the shipping conditions and further depicts a telephone number and email address for Customer Support, as well as an address, which is in California, USA.

As soon as Complainant became aware of Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name, it instructed its authorized representative to send a cease and desist letter to Respondent in order to notify the infringement of Complainant's trademark IKEA, requesting to immediately cease and desist any use and the transfer of the disputed domain name.

This was done via Respondent's contact form - provided in the Whois records data – as no other verifiable contact details were publicly available on the website.

Neither a reply was received, nor compliance could be perceived.

Therefore, Complainant filed this Complaint.

Respondent

Respondent is Homegoo Dsstore, with domicile in Hubue, China. The disputed domain name <ikeabrands.com> was registered on 3 June 2026 and it resolves to a website clearly aiming to resemble the website of Complainant.

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

According to the Policy paragraph 4(a)(i) it needs first to be established that:

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

The disputed domain name reproduces Complainant's IKEA trademark in its entirety with the addition of the term "brands".

Complainant continues by stating that the top-level domain name ".com" is merely instrumental to the use on the Internet - as found in The Forward Association, Inc., v. Enterprises Unlimited (NAF case FA0008000095491, October 3, 2000) and numerous others - and not able to affect the confusing similarity of the domain name to Complainant's trademark.

Moreover, the IKEA trademark is inherently distinctive, and the addition of the term "brands" does not dispel confusing similarity. On the contrary, the term is used in a descriptive manner that reinforces the false impression that the website is officially connected, sponsored, or affiliated with Complainant.

This combination increases the likelihood of confusion by suggesting a false affiliation with Complainant, as indicated in the decision Fendi S.r.l. v. Federico Porcedda Case No. D2018-1265:

“This Panel agrees with the Complainant's opinion and previous UDRP decisions, affirming that confusing similarity is generally established when the domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, and the addition of descriptive prefixes and suffixes does not avoid confusing similarity. […] The further addition of the letter "s" is also insufficient to avoid confusing similarity.”.

Thus, the disputed domain name is undoubtedly confusingly similar to the trademark IKEA in which Complainant has rights.

In light of the above, Complainant concludes that the domain name is confusingly similar to the prior registered trademark in which Complainant has rights in satisfaction of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

Panel findings

The Panel agrees with the assertion of Complainant in concluding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant’s trademark, as IKEA is a distinctive mark and ‘brands’ is just a descriptor. In fact, ‘brands’ is also a misleading descriptor as it concerns only one brand, namely the IKEA brand.

Further, the trademark registrations for IKEA as submitted to this Complaint predate the registration of the disputed domain name, and thus the trademark rights prevail.

Consequently, the Panel agrees with this assertion of Complainant.

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 Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

According to the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(ii) it needs further to be established that:

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

Paragraph 4 (c) of the Policy provides circumstances that could demonstrate that Respondent has no rights to and legitimate interests in the Domain Name. These circumstances are not exclusive. Circumstances that are providing rights or legitimate interests to the domain name are:

(i) before any notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

(ii) Respondent (as an individual, business, or other organization) has been commonly known by the domain name, even if though it has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

Further, according to the WIPO Case No. D2003-0455, Croatia Airlines d. d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd., Complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. Once such prima facie case is made, Respondent carries the burden of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If Respondent fails to do so, Complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a) (ii) of the UDRP.

Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name has been registered by Respondent without authorization of Complainant and that it is clearly impersonating Complainant’s brand and identity, as is demonstrated by the enclosed printouts of the website.

Respondent has no affiliation, relationship, license, or authorization of any kind from Complainant to use Complainant’s domain name and/or trademark. Such use of the disputed domain name is therefore unauthorized and misleading, as it falsely suggests the existence of an affiliation, endorsement, or commercial connection between Respondent and Complainant, although no such relationship exists.

Further, Complainant asserts that it is not in possession of, nor aware of the existence of, any evidence demonstrating that Respondent might be commonly known by the domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name as an individual, business, or other organization.

Moreover, Complainant could not find any evidence on which to ground the assumption that the Respondent is making a bona fide offering of goods or services related to the denomination IKEA, nor any bona fide use of the trademark IKEA.

Thus, Complainant concludes that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

Panel findings

The Panel agrees with Complainant that it is impossible to conceive that Respondent had a right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name. Moreover, Respondent did not reply as such in this Complaint. Thus, the Panel considers this to be true.

Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown 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

According to the Policy paragraph 4(a)(iii), it finally needs to be established that:

(iii) the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Paragraph 4 (b) of the Policy provides circumstances that demonstrate that Respondent has registered and used the domain name in bad faith. These circumstances are not exclusive. Those circumstances are, for example:

(i) circumstances indicating that Respondent has registered or has acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) Respondent has registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) Respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to it's web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your web site or location or of a product or service on your web site or location.

Complainant asserts and substantiates that the trademark IKEA has been used extensively and exclusively by Complainant since 1943. Through its long-established and widespread use in several countries of the world the trademark enjoys worldwide reputation in the sector of furniture.

Therefore, IKEA has become a well-known trademark and this also has been indicated in several UDRP decisions:

WIPO decision No. D2016-0067:

"The Panel is satisfied that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith for the following reasons: (a) The Panel finds that at the time of registration the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's well-known trademark and registered the disputed domain name incorporating that well-known trademark in bad faith for the following reasons: (i) The Complainant's IKEA trademark is distinctive. At the time of registration of the disputed domain name on February 25, 2015, it was one of the world's most well-known global brands. IKEA is not a term that anyone would likely use descriptively. It is inconceivable to the Panel that the Respondent could have coincidentally chosen the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's marks, as it encapsulates the distinctive mark IKEA."

And WIPO Case No. D2016-0432:

'The element of bad faith is clearly established by the fact that the trademark IKEA is one of the most well-known trademarks in the world in connection with furniture and household items.

And WIPO decision No. D2017-221:

"At the time of the registration of the disputed domain name, the Complainant's trademark and business had both been very well-known for many years; it is not plausible that the Respondent stumbled on the name in the disputed domain name, much less its relevant Punycode, by chance or serendipity. This alone strongly suggests a bad faith registration, with the motive of making use of the disputed domain name to deceive Internet users into believing that the website linked to the disputed domain name was linked to the Complainant and its brand."

Further, Complainant asserts that it is inconceivable that Respondent was unaware of the existence of Complainant's registered trademark at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name.

Further, Complainant alleges that Respondent has registered the disputed domain name having in mind the value of Complainant's trademark and through its use aims to profit from IKEA trademark's fame. Thus, the internet user will be misled into believing that the false website impersonates Complainant's trademark IKEA. Moreover, the internet user will expect that the website is affiliated

with or endorsed by Complainant.

As such, Respondent aimed to profit from IKEA trademark's fame in order to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the website corresponding by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. This aspect reveals the implausibility of any good faith use of the domain name by Respondent, according to Complainant.

Panel findings

The Panel first of all concludes that it is sufficiently demonstrated that the IKEA trademark is a well-known trademark. Moreover, even if it was not demonstrated, it could have been said that the public in general will recognize the IKEA trademark as a famous brand.

In the light of the foregoing, it is indeed inconceivable that Respondent was unaware of the IKEA trademark when registering the disputed domain.

Based on the submitted printouts of the website belonging to the disputed domain name, which show the IKEA brand and IKEA-related products, the story of the origin of the brand and shipping conditions that are so typical for IKEA products (flat packaging), it is inconceivable to the Panel that the use of the disputed domain name could have any goodwill intention. The Panel agrees with Complainant that Respondent must have had the aim to mislead internet users into believing that the website is affiliated with or endorsed by Complainant and consequently profit from the trademark of Complainant.

Moreover, this is not counter-argued by Respondent.

Thus, the Panel concludes that registration and use of the disputed domain name is in bad faith.

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.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **ikeabrands.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Marieke Westgeest**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-11-17

Publish the Decision