

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Valtra Oy AB v. Oracle, Oracle Tech  
Case No. D2023-3422

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Valtra Oy AB, Finland, represented by AGCO Ltd., United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Oracle, Oracle Tech, Nigeria.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <valtrafinance.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 10, 2023. On August 11, 2023, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 11, 2023, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 14, 2023, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on August 17, 2023.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 23, 2023. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 12, 2023. The Respondent did not submit a response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 13, 2023.

The Center appointed Adam Taylor as the sole panelist in this matter on September 18, 2023. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

#### **4. Factual Background**

The Complainant is one of the world's largest manufacturers of tractors. Its related services include the arrangement of finance for purchase of its products.

The Complainant owns many trade marks for VALTRA including European Union Trade Mark No. 005455175, registered on August 24, 2007, in classes 7, 12, 25 and 28.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 30, 2021.

As of August 10, 2023, the disputed domain name resolved to a website bearing a "Valtra" logo and headed: "Valtra Finance. Working Together To Deliver Growth To Your Investments." The site purported to offer investment-related services, and it invited users to buy bitcoins. The homepage included buttons labelled "INSURANCE CERTIFICATE" and "REGISTRATION CERTIFICATE", both of which comprised corporate information about the Complainant.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

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

##### **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

#### **6. Discussion and Findings**

##### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trade mark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of other terms (here, "finance") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

## **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often-impossible task of “proving a negative”, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a *prima facie* case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a *prima facie* case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s *prima facie* showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Furthermore, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (*e.g.*, impersonation/passing off or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

## **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Panel notes that for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular but without limitation, that if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

Given the evidence of use of the disputed domain name for a website that effectively impersonated the Complainant, including by use of the Complainant’s highly distinctive trade mark and of “certificates” listing the Complainant’s corporate details, plainly for some sort of fraud, the Panel readily concludes that the Respondent has intentionally created a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trade mark in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

## **7. Decision**

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name, <valtrafinance.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Adam Taylor/

**Adam Taylor**

Sole Panelist

Date: October 2, 2023