Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108107

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108107
Time of filing	2025-11-11 12:19:18
Domain names	siemensgroup-sg.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Siemens Trademark GmbH & Co. KG

Respondent

Name	anil kumar

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 bases its Complaint on the following trademark:

- International trademark registration “SIEMENS”, no. 637074, registered on March 31, 1995, for goods and services in classes 01, 03, 05, 06, 07, 08, 09, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21, 28, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a trademark holding company, licensing trademarks within Siemens Group. The Complainant is a subsidiary of Siemens Aktiengesellschaft, which is the ultimate mother company of the Siemens Group. The turnover of the Siemens Group in 2024 was 75,9 billion Euro, and the group employs more than 310.000 people worldwide.

Siemens Group is headquartered in Berlin and Munich. It is one of the world’s largest corporations, providing innovative technologies and comprehensive know-how to benefit customers in 190 countries. Founded more than 175 years ago, the company is active, among others, in the fields of Automation and Control, Power, Transportation, Logistics, Information and Communications, Medical Technology etc.

The Complainant is the owner of SIEMENS trademark as cited above.

The disputed domain name <siemensgroup-sg.com> was registered on August 23, 2025 and resolves to a website under construction, while being used within the email address hr@siemensgroup-sg.com, impersonating an alleged Siemens talent acquisition specialist in Singapore.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be

transferred to it.

The Complainant's contentions are the following:

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it. The disputed domain name <siemensgroup-sg.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's earlier trademark SIEMENS, that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name for a number of reasons and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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. Confusing Similarity

The Panel agrees that the disputed domain name <siemensgroup-sg.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's earlier trademark SIEMENS. The disputed domain name incorporates entirely the Complainant’s earlier SIEMENS trademark with the addition of the generic term “group”, followed by a dash and the letters “sg”, which correspond to the country code of Singapore, which is not sufficient to prevent the finding that the domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark.

Moreover, the extension “.com” is not to be taken into consideration when examining the similarity between the Complainant’s trademark and the disputed domain name (WIPO Case No. D2005-0016, Accor v. Noldc Inc.). The mere adjunction of a gTLD such as “.com” is irrelevant as it is well established that the generic Top Level Domain is insufficient to avoid a finding of confusing similarity (WIPO Case No. 2013-0820, L’Oréal v Tina Smith, WIPO Case No. D2008-0820 Titoni AG v Runxin Wang and WIPO Case No. D2009-0877, Alstom v. Itete Peru S.A.).

Therefore, the Panel is satisfied that the first condition under the Policy is met.

2. Lack of Respondent's rights or legitimate interests

The Complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. Once such prima facie case is made, the burden of proof shifts to the respondent to come forward with appropriate allegations or evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. If the respondent fails to come forward with such appropriate allegations or evidence, a complainant is generally deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

Based on the available evidence, the Respondent does not appear to be known by the disputed domain name as such is not identified in the WHOIS database as the disputed domain name.

Moreover, the Respondent is not related to the Complainant in any way. The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent.

No license nor authorization has been granted by the Complainant to the Respondent to make any use of the Complainant's trademark SIEMENS, or to apply for registration of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website under construction, while being used within the email address hr@siemensgroup-sg.com, impersonating an alleged Siemens talent acquisition specialist in Singapore, aspect which lead to a risk of confusion with the Complainant and its trademark, as well as to a risk of fraudulent activity.

The Respondent had an opportunity to comment on the Complaint's allegations by filing a Response, which the Respondent failed to do.

All the above do not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services, or to a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Thus, the Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has at least established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Panel takes the view that also the second requirement under the Policy is met.

3. Bad Faith

The Complainant's trademark SIEMENS predates the registration date of the disputed domain name and enjoys a distinctive character. The Respondent has chosen to register the disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant's earlier SIEMENS trademark with the addition of the generic term "group entirely", followed by a dash and the letters "sg", which correspond to the country code of Singapore, in order to create confusion with such trademark. Therefore, the Panel concludes that at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant's trademark and has intentionally registered it in order to benefit from the distinctive character of the Complainant's trademark.

In the present case, the following factors should be considered:

- the Complainant's SIEMENS trademark predates the registration date of the disputed domain name, being a trademark with a distinctive character;
- the Respondent failed to submit any response and has not provided any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use of the disputed domain name;
- the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, which includes in its entirety the Complainant's earlier SIEMENS trademark with the addition of the generic term "group", followed by a dash and the letters "sg", which correspond to the country code of Singapore, in order to create confusion with such trademark;
- the disputed domain name resolves to a website under construction, while being used within the email address hr@siemensgroup-sg.com, impersonating an alleged Siemens talent acquisition specialist in Singapore who requested to an applicant for a supposed position of "Director of Project" in "Siemens Singapore", to proceed to the payment of a "security deposit", aspect which lead to a risk of confusion with the Complainant and its trademark, as well as to a risk of a fraudulent activity;
- any good faith use of the disputed domain name would be implausible, as the trademark SIEMENS is linked to the Complainant and the Respondent has no business relationship with the Complainant, nor was ever authorised to use a domain name confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

In light of the foregoing, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has registered and has been using the disputed domain name in bad faith. Thus, also the third and last condition under the Policy is satisfied.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **siemensgroup-sg.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Delia-Mihaela Belciu**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-12-18

Publish the Decision