

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-103794

Case number	CAC-UDRP-103794
-------------	------------------------

Time of filing	2021-05-12 10:33:47
----------------	----------------------------

Domain names	frontlinepacks.com
--------------	---------------------------

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM ANIMAL HEALTH FRANCE
--------------	--

Complainant representative

Organization	Nameshield (Laurent Becker)
--------------	------------------------------------

Respondent

Organization	Distribution & Transportation
--------------	--

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

International Trade Mark No. 1245236 FRONTLINE registered on 30 January 2015 for various goods in classes 3 and 5.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

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

The Complainant asserts it is the "number one global player in the pet and equine markets" and has provided evidence that it develops veterinary products. It further has provided evidence that one of its veterinary products is a flea, tick and lice treatment for dogs and cats sold under the trade mark FRONTLINE. These products are sold in packs.

Besides these assertions it provides very little detail about itself or its use of FRONTLINE.

The Complainant asserts it is the trade mark owner of International Trade Mark No. 1245236 FRONTLINE registered on 30 January 2015 for various goods in classes 3 and 5, which is based on a French trade mark registration and designates protection in a number of countries.

The disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent on 26 April 2021. The Respondent registered its name as "Distribution & Transportation" and its address as a location in the United States of America.

The Respondent has directed the disputed domain name to a parking page with sponsored links, including to the Complainant's business.

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

Paragraph (4)(a) of the Policy lists three elements that the Complainant must prove to merit a finding that the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent be transferred to the Complainant:

- 1) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark ("mark") in which the Complainant has rights; and
- 2) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- 3) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has satisfied all three elements for the principal reasons set out below.

RIGHTS IN AN IDENTICAL OR CONFUSINGLY SIMILAR TRADEMARK

As mentioned above the Complainant claims registered rights over the trade mark FRONTLINE through the designation of a number of jurisdictions in an international application. Such designation pre-dates the registrations of the disputed domain name by a number of years.

To satisfy paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy it is enough that the Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has registered rights in a single trademark in a single jurisdiction that predates the registration of the disputed domain name (even if that single jurisdiction is not one in which the Respondent resides or operates) (Koninklijke KPN N.V. v. Telepathy, Inc D2001-0217

(WIPO May 7, 2001); see also WIPO Case Nos. D2012-0141 and D2011-1436).

Prior registered rights in FRONTLINE are clearly established here.

The next question is whether the disputed domain name, <frontlinepacks.com>, is confusingly similar to FRONTLINE.

The Complainant asserts that the addition of the word "packs" in the disputed domain is generic and does not prevent confusion.

The Panel actually notes that not only does PACKS have a generic meaning but annexures to the Complaint clearly show the products provided under the FRONTLINE products are sold in packs.

The Panel is therefore satisfied that <frontlinepacks.com> is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Respondent's name bears no resemblance to the disputed domain name. Further, the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page that has links to the Complainant's website. Such use of the domain name does not establish rights or legitimate interests. It simply shows the Complainant has chosen to park the domain name for commercial gain.

There is simply no basis to conclude that the Respondent has rights or interests in the disputed domain name.

BAD FAITH

It is the Complainant's onus to establish bad faith. Here the Panel finds that onus has been met, however not by a large margin. As mentioned above, the Complainant has provided very little detail on its use of FRONTLINE and any reputation in that mark.

Failing to redirect a domain name to an active website or merely directing the domain name to a basic parking page that contains links to other websites can be legitimate conduct. It is commonly referred to as 'passive holding'. Whilst it is true that the passive holding of a domain name may, in appropriate circumstances, be indicative of bad faith. It will only be so indicative when all the circumstances of the Respondent's behaviour indicate he or she is acting in bad faith (Telstra Corporation Ltd v. Nuclear Marshmallows D2000-0003 (WIPO February 18, 2000)). There is no law or rule that a domain name cannot be parked or that it must be used to redirect to an active website within a specific period of time.

In the present matter the parking page to which the disputed domain name directs contains links to the Complainant's website. The Complainant has put allegations to the Respondent that it had no bona fide purpose to so use the disputed domain name and it is likely to create confusion. Further, it puts the allegation to the Respondent that its conduct was for the purpose of commercial gain. The Respondent has failed to rebut these allegations and the Panel finds they are made out.

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

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **FRONTLINEPACKS.COM**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Mr Andrew Norman Sykes
------	-------------------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2021-06-21

Publish the Decision
