

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-102864

Case number	CAC-UDRP-102864
Time of filing	2020-01-20 10:01:02
Domain names	boehringerengelheims.com

Case administrator

Name	Šárka Glasslová (Case admin)
------	------------------------------

Complainant

Organization	Boehringer Ingelheim Pharma GmbH & Co.KG
--------------	--

Complainant representative

Organization	Nameshield (Enora Millocheau)
--------------	-------------------------------

Respondent

Organization	Jowat
--------------	-------

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings pending or decided which relate to the disputed domain name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant is a German family-owned pharmaceutical group of companies with roots going back to 1885, when it was founded by Albert Boehringer (1861-1939) in Ingelheim am Rhein.

Ever since, Boehringer has become a global research-driven pharmaceutical enterprise and has today about roughly 50,000 employees. The three main business areas of BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM are: human pharmaceuticals, animal health and biopharmaceuticals. In 2018, BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM achieved net sales of around 17.5 billion euros.

The Complainant owns a large portfolio of trademarks including the wording "BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM" in several countries, such as the international trademark BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM n°221544, registered since July 2nd, 1959 and duly renewed.

Furthermore, the Complainant owns multiple domain names consisting in the wording "BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM, such as <boehringer-ingelheim.com> registered since September 1st, 1995, and <boehringerengelheim.com> registered since July 4th, 2004.

The disputed domain name <boehringerengelheims.com> was registered on January 14th, 2019. The disputed domain name

resolves to a parking page with commercial links.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Respondent contends that the Respondent is not known as the disputed domain name, but as “Jowat”. Past panels have held that a Respondent was not commonly known by a disputed domain name if the WHOIS information was not similar to the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the Complainant also claims that the disputed domain name is a typosquatted version of the trademark BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM. Typosquatting is the practice of registering a domain name in an attempt to take advantage of Internet users’ typographical errors and can be evidence that a respondent lacks rights and legitimate interests in the domain name. Please see:

- Forum Case No. 1765498, Spotify AB v. The LINE The Line / The Line (“The Panel finds that Respondent’s registration of the domain name is typosquatting and indicates it lacks rights and legitimate interests in the domain name per Policy paragraph 4(a)(ii).”);
 - Forum Case No. 1597465, The Hackett Group, Inc. v. Brian Herns / The Hackett Group (“The Panel agrees that typosquatting is occurring, and finds this is additional evidence that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests under Policy paragraph 4(a)(ii).”).
-

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

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 three essential issues under the paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are whether:

- i. the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- ii. the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name; and
- iii. the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

2. The Panel reviewed carefully all documents provided by the Complainant. The Respondent did not provide the Panel with any documents or defensive statements. The Panel also visited all available websites and public information concerning the

disputed domain name, namely the WHOIS databases.

3. The UDRP Rules clearly say in its Article 3 that any person or entity may initiate an administrative proceeding by submitting a complaint in accordance with the Policy and these Rules.

4. The Panel therefore came to the following conclusions:

a) The Complainant has clearly proved that it is a long standing and successful leading pharmaceutical company. It is clear that its trademarks and domain names containing the term “BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM” are well-known.

The Complainant states and proves that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademarks and its domain names. Indeed, the trademark is partially incorporated in the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name is therefore deemed identical or confusingly similar.

b) It has to be stressed that it was proven that there are no fair rights of the Respondent to the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not generally known by the disputed domain name and has not acquired any trademark or service mark rights in the name or mark.

Neither license nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Complainant's trademarks or apply for registration of the disputed domain name by the Complainant.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interest with respect to the disputed domain name.

c) The disputed domain name was registered with an intention to attract customers of another well-known domain name/registered trademark holder. Therefore there cannot be found any legitimate interest of the Respondent.

It is clear that the Complainant's trademarks and website(s) were used by the Complainant long time before the disputed domain name was registered and used. It is therefore concluded that the disputed domain name was registered with an intention to attract customers of another well-known domain name/registered trademark holder.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

For the reasons stated above, it is the decision of this Panel that the Complainant has satisfied all three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **BOEHRINGERINGELHEIMS.COM**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Dr. Vít Horáček
------	------------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION	2020-02-26
------------------------	------------
