

## Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-103455

Case number	CAC-UDRP-103455
Time of filing	2020-12-15 11:12:28
Domain names	boehringeringelhimpetebates.com

### Case administrator

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

### Complainant

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

### Complainant representative

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

### Respondent

Organization	Fundacion Comercio Electronico
--------------	--------------------------------

#### 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 owns a portfolio of trademarks including the terms "BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM" in several countries, such as:

- the international trademark BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM® n°221544, registered since July 2, 1959; and,
- the international trademark BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM® n°568844, registered since March 22, 1991.

#### FACTUAL BACKGROUND

##### FACTS ASSERTED BY THE COMPLAINANT AND NOT CONTESTED BY THE RESPONDENT:

The Complainant cites previous UDRP cases related to the proceeding:

CAC Case No. 103124, *Boehringer Ingelheim Pharma GmbH & Co.KG v. Fundacion Comercio Electronico <boehringeringelhimpetreebates.com>* ("The disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademarks are very similar

since they differ in a mere addition of misspelled version of a generic term "pet rebates" (i.e. addition of "PETRREEBATES") to the Complainant's trademark. This, however, cannot prevent the association in the eyes of internet consumers between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademarks and thus the likelihood of confusion still exists. To conclude, addition of a non-distinctive term cannot sufficiently distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant's trademarks.").

Forum Case No. FA 1781783, Skechers U.S.A., Inc. and Skechers U.S.A., Inc. II v. Chad Moston / Elite Media Group <bobsfromsketchers.com> ("Here, the WHOIS information of record identifies Respondent as "Chad Moston / Elite Media Group." The Panel therefore finds under Policy 4(c)(ii) that Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name under Policy 4(c)(ii).").

- Forum Case No. FA 970871, Vance Int'l, Inc. v. Abend (concluding that the operation of a pay-per-click website at a confusingly similar domain name does not represent a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, regardless of whether or not the links resolve to competing or unrelated websites or if the respondent is itself commercially profiting from the click-through fees);

- WIPO Case No. D2007-1695, Mayflower Transit LLC v. Domains by Proxy Inc./Yariv Moshe ("Respondent's use of a domain name confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark for the purpose of offering sponsored links does not of itself qualify as a bona fide use.").

- WIPO Case No. D2019-0208, Boehringer Ingelheim Pharma GmbH & Co. KG v. Marius Graur ("Because of the very distinctive nature of the Complainant's trademark [BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM] and its widespread and longstanding use and reputation in the relevant field, it is inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without being aware of the Complainant's legal rights.");

- CAC Case No. 102274, BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM PHARMA GMBH & CO.KG v. Karen Liles ("In the absence of a response from Karen Liles and given the reputation of the Complainant and its trademark (see, among others, WIPO Case No. D2016-0021, Boehringer Ingelheim Pharma GmbH & Co.KG v. Kate Middleton), the Panel infers that the Respondent had the Complainant's trademarks BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM in mind when registering the disputed domain name.").

WIPO Case No. D2018-0497, StudioCanal v. Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC / Sudjam Admin, Sudjam LLC ("In that circumstance, whether the commercial gain from misled Internet users is gained by the Respondent or by the Registrar (or by another third party), it remains that the Respondent controls and cannot (absent some special circumstance) disclaim responsibility for, the content appearing on the website to which the disputed domain name resolve [...] so the Panel presumes that the Respondent has allowed the disputed domain name to be used with the intent to attract Internet users for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website to which the disputed domain name resolves. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.").

---

#### 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

##### FIRST CONDITION

It is commonly accepted that the first condition 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 trademark and the disputed domain name. This test typically involves a side-by-side comparison of the domain name and the textual components of the relevant trademark to assess whether the mark is recognizable within the domain name. In this comparison, the cc- or g- TLD is usually not taken into account.

The disputed domain name includes entirely the Complainant's trademark with the exception of the misspelling (i.e. the deletion of the letter "E" in the Complainant's trademark) and the missing hyphen.

These two slight differences are not sufficient to exclude confusing similarity.

The Panel is of the opinion that in a situation where the Complainant's trademark is entirely (or nearly entirely with the exception of a misspelling) included in the litigious Domain name, the adjunction of generic terms does not generally change the assessment as far as the first condition is concerned.

First condition is satisfied.

##### SECOND CONDITION

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.

The Complainant claims, without being contradicted, that:

- The Complainant has not licensed or authorized the Respondent to register or use the disputed domain name;
- There is no evidence that the Respondent is known by the disputed domain name or owns any corresponding registered trademarks; and
- The disputed domain name resolves to a parking page with commercial links.

The Respondent has chosen not to answer to the Complaint.

Based on the elements presented by Complainant, the Panels find that the second condition is satisfied.

##### THIRD CONDITION

The disputed domain name incorporates nearly entirely the Complainant's trademark. In the absence of any credible explanation, such incorporation appears as a direct reference to the Complainant's trademark. It is even more probable when the notoriety of the Complainant's trademark is taken into account. There is no apparent plausible reason for the Respondent to register the domain name, except its probable intention of taking advantage of the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page with commercial links which are, most probably and in the absence of any information provided by the Respondent, the reason for registering the domain name (pay per click).

It is therefore prima facie highly probable that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name having the Complainant in mind, and acted in order to attract traffic by using the notoriety of the Complainant in order to make money when a visitor clicks on the commercial links inserted on the Respondent's website.

The Respondent has chosen not to answer to the Complaint.

Based on the elements presented by Complainant, the Panel finds that the third condition is satisfied.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **BOEHRINGERINGELHIMPETEBATES.COM**: Transferred

## PANELLISTS

Name	Mr. Etienne Wéry
------	------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2021-01-07

Publish the Decision