

## Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107657

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107657
Time of filing	2025-06-13 09:47:21
Domain names	boehringer-ingelheim.com

### Case administrator

Name	Olga Dvořáková (Case admin)
------	-----------------------------

### Complainant

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

### Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.
--------------	-------------------

### Respondent

Organization	Inspired care
--------------	---------------

#### 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 International trademark BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM n° 221544 in classes 01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 16, 17, 19, 29, 30, 32 registered since July 2, 1959, and in effect.

#### FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a 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. Since then the Complainant has become a global research-driven pharmaceutical enterprise with roughly 54000 employees. In 2024 alone, net sales of the Boehringer Ingelheim group of companies amounted to about EUR 26 billion. The disputed domain name has been registered on June 11, 2025 and resolves to an inactive website. However, MX servers are configured.

The identity of the registrant was initially concealed.

#### PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant states, inter alia, that the disputed domain name <boehringer-ingelheim.com> is confusingly similar to its trademark BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM and its associated domain names. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name <boehringer-ingelheim.com> and he is not related in any way to the Complainant. The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with, the Respondent. The Complainant contends that the Respondent did not use the disputed domain name or has no demonstrable plan to use the disputed domain name.

**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

In order to succeed in its claim, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied:

- (i) The 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 domain name; and
- (iii) The domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

**A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

The Complainant has established the fact that it has valid trademark rights for “Boehringer Ingelheim”.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Boehringer Ingelheim mark of the Complainant since the modifications in the disputed domain name, the addition of the letter “c” does not influence the overall character of the disputed domain name compared to the trademark of the Complainant. Such typosquatting is widely acknowledged as creating likelihood of confusion. It is the consensus view of WIPO panels that a domain name which contains a common or obvious misspelling of a trademark normally 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 amongst many: Wachovia Corporation v. Peter Carrington, WIPO Case No. D2002-0775, <wochovia.com>)

The Panel therefore considers the disputed domain name to be confusingly similar to the trademarks Boehringer Ingelheim in which the Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

**B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

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 the name “Boehringer Ingelheim” 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.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

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 that 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.

It is the consensus view of panels (following the decision Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows, WIPO Case No. D2000-0003, <telstra.org>) that the apparent lack of active use of the domain name without any active attempt to sell or to contact the trademark holder (passive holding), does not as such prevent a finding of bad faith. Examples of what may be cumulative circumstances found to be indicative of bad faith include that no response to the complaint has been filed and the registrant’s concealment of its identity and the implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put. Such circumstances, as well as typo squatting as indication are given in the present case.

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. This result is further confirmed by the given typosquatting which furthermore indicate the intention of attempting to attract, for commercial gain, also by means of emails sent under the disputed domain name, 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. that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name primarily with

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. boehringer-ingelheim.com: Transferred

PANELLISTS

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

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-07-15

Publish the Decision