

**Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-104021**

Case number	<b>CAC-UDRP-104021</b>
Time of filing	<b>2021-09-14 09:59:44</b>
Domain names	<b>boehringer-ingelheim.cam</b>

**Case administrator**

Organization	<b>Denisa Bilík (CAC) (Case admin)</b>
--------------	--

**Complainant**

Organization	<b>Boehringer Ingelheim Pharma GmbH &amp; Co.KG</b>
--------------	---

**Complainant representative**

Organization	<b>NAMESHIELD S.A.S.</b>
--------------	--------------------------

**Respondent**

Name	<b>Shiab Li</b>
------	-----------------

## 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 is the owner of the following Boehringer Ingelheim trademarks (collectively, the „Boehringer Ingelheim Marks“):

- International Registration No. 221544 for „Boehringer-Ingelheim“ registered on June 9, 1951; and
- International Registration No. 568844 for „Boehringer Ingelheim“ registered on March 22, 1991.

The Complainant owns multiple domain names consisting of the wording „Boehringer Ingelheim“ such as <boehringer-ingelheim.com> which was registered on August 31, 1995.

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, Boehringer Ingelheim Pharma GmbH & Co. KG, is a family-owned pharmaceutical group of companies tracing its origin back to 1885. It was founded by Albert Boehringer in Ingelheim am Rhein and has since become a global research-driven pharmaceutical enterprise with some 50,000 employees today. The Complainant's areas of business are human pharmaceuticals, animal health and bio-pharmaceuticals. In 2013, the Complainant's net sales amounted to about EUR17.5 billion. The disputed domain name <boehringer-ingelheim.cam> was registered on September 9, 2021, and resolved

to an inactive website.

---

#### PARTIES CONTENTIONS

NO ADMINISTRATIVELY COMPLIANT RESPONSE HAS BEEN FILED.

#### PARTIES' CONTENTIONS:

##### COMPLAINANT:

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical to the Boehringer Ingelheim marks on the basis that the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's trademark and the addition of the generic top-level domain name suffixes ("gTLD") ".cam" is insufficient to avoid the finding that the disputed domain name is identical to the Boehringer Ingelheim Marks.

The Complainant also argues that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. In addition, the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant nor did the Complainant license or authorize the Respondent to use the Boehringer Ingelheim Marks.

The Complainant further asserts that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith as the Respondent should have known of the Complainant's Boehringer Ingelheim Marks at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant also asserts that the Respondent is attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's websites, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the disputed domain name.

---

#### 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

##### A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy requires a complainant to show that a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights.

A registered trademark provides a clear indication that the rights in the mark shown on the trademark certificate belong to its respective owner. The Complainant has provided evidence that it owns the Boehringer Ingelheim Marks.

The Complainant's Boehringer Ingelheim Marks is wholly incorporated into the disputed domain name without any modification.

In addition, gTLD is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test (WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.11). The addition of a gTLD to a disputed domain name does not avoid confusing similarity as the use of a TLD is technically required to operate a domain name (see *Accor v. Noldc Inc.* WIPO Case No. D2005-0016; *F. Hoffmann-La Roche AG v. Macalve e-dominios S.A.*, WIPO Case No. D2006-0451; *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. D2000-0003; *L'Oréal v Tina Smith*, WIPO Case No. 2013-0820; *Titoni AG v Runxin Wang*, WIPO Case No. D2008-0820; and *Alstom v. Itete Peru S.A.* WIPO Case No. D2009-0877).

Therefore, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is identical to the Boehringer Ingelheim Marks and the element under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is satisfied.

## B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy requires the complainant to show that the respondent has no rights or interests in respect of the domain name. Once the complainant establishes a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the domain name, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to show that it has rights or legitimate interests in respect to the domain name (see WIPO Overview 3.0, paragraph 2.1).

In the present case, the Complainant has demonstrated prima facie that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and the Respondent has failed to assert any such rights or legitimate interests.

The Complainant submitted evidence that it did not authorize or license the Respondent to use the Boehringer Ingelheim Marks (See *OSRAM GmbH. v. Mohammed Rafi/Domain Admin, Privacy Protection Service INC d/b/a PrivacyProtect.org*, WIPO Case No. D2015-1149; *Sanofi-Aventis v. Abigail Wallace*, WIPO Case No. D2009-0735).

In addition, the evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Respondent did not submit a response in the present case and did not provide any explanation or evidence to show rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name which are sufficient to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case.

The Panel is therefore of the view that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and accordingly, paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy is satisfied.

## C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The complainant must show that the respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith (Policy, paragraph 4(a)(iii)). Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides circumstances that may evidence bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

The Complainant has submitted evidence that the disputed domain name resolved to an inactive webpage. It is well established that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding (see WIPO Overview 3.0, paragraph 3.3). The test to apply is that of the totality of circumstances. In doing so we must look to: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, (iii) the respondent's concealing its identity or use of false contact details (noted to be in breach of its registration agreement), and (iv) the implausibility of any good faith use to which the domain name may be put.

In this case, the evidence shows that the Complainant's mark is distinctive. The distinctive character of the Complainant's mark is evidence that the Respondent is unlikely to have registered the disputed domain name without sight and knowledge of the Complainant's Boehringer Ingelheim Marks and it is implausible that there is any good faith use to which the disputed domain

name may be put to. It is also the Complainant's evidence that the Respondent could not have registered the disputed domain name without prior knowledge of the Complainant's marks as the Respondent's name has no connection with the Complainant's Boehringer Ingelheim Marks which were registered long ago. This is another indicator of bad faith on the part of the Respondent (see Boursorama SA v. Estrade Nicolas, WIPO Case No. D2017-1463).

The Respondent did not submit a Response in this proceeding which is a further indication of the Respondent's bad faith, which was considered by the Panel.

Based on the evidence presented to the Panel, including the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's Boehringer Ingelheim Marks, the fact that the disputed domain name was used for passive holding and the fact that no Response was submitted by the Respondent, the Panel draws the inference that the disputed domain name was 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. **BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM.CAM**: Transferred

## PANELLISTS

Name	<b>Mr. Jonathan Agmon</b>
------	---------------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION	2021-10-17
------------------------	------------

Publish the Decision