

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-103756

Case number	CAC-UDRP-103756
Time of filing	2021-04-26 07:57:21
Domain names	behringer-Ingelheim.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

Name	Judy A Hapgood
------	----------------

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 several trademarks consisting in the wording BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM in several countries, among them the active International registration 221544- Boehringer-Ingelheim in numerous classes and extended to numerous countries.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a family-owned pharmaceutical group of companies with roots going back to the 19th century.

The Panel is aware of the fact that the Complainant is a global research-driven pharmaceutical enterprise and has today numerous affiliated companies world-wide with roughly 52,000 employees. In 2020 alone, net sales of the Boehringer Ingelheim group of companies amounted to about EUR 19.6 billion.

The disputed domain name has been registered on April 19, 2021. The website under the disputed domain name shows links to commercial activities not connected to the Complainant.

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. It is the common view among UDRP panelists that a domain name which contains a common or obvious misspelling of a trademark usually will be found to be confusingly similar to such trademark, where the misspelled trademark remains the dominant or principal component of the domain name, see *Edmunds.com, Inc. v. Digi Real Estate Foundation*, WIPO Case No. D2006-1043, <edmundss.com>. The disputed domain name is such a typosquatting domain and is accordingly confusingly similar to the trademark of the Complainant.
2. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, since the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant nor has the Complainant granted any permission or consent to the Respondent to use its trademarks or designations confusingly similar to its trademarks. Furthermore, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, since there is no indication that the Respondent is commonly known by neither the name "Boehringer Ingelheim" nor "behringer-Ingelhseim" or that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

3. The Panel follows the assessment of the panel in the WIPO Case D2016-0021 *Boehringer Ingelheim Pharma GmbH & Co.KG v. Kate Middleton* that "Boehringer Ingelheim" is a well-known mark. Accordingly, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its trademarks when registering the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to make use of a designation which is highly similar to its marks. This Panel does not see any conceivable legitimate use that could be made by the Respondent of this particular domain name without the Complainant's authorization.

The circumstances of this case, in particular the typosquatting also indicate that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name primarily with the intention of attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its potential website or other online locations, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of such website or location, or of a product or service on such website or location. The Panel therefore considers the disputed domain name to have been registered and used in bad faith in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **BEHRINGER-LNGELHSEIM.COM**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Dietrich Beier
------	-----------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION	2021-05-28
------------------------	------------

Publish the Decision
