Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108206

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108206
Time of filing	2025-12-05 09:47:53
Domain names	frontlineplusforcats.com, frontlineplusfordogs.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Boehringer Ingelheim Animal Health France

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Organization	Test Boost Max Supplement

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 names.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant owns the following trademarks:

- International trademark FRONTLINE, No. 621912, registered since 9 June 1994; and
- International trademark FRONTLINE, No. 1245236, registered since 30 January 2015.

("**Complainant's Trademarks**").

The disputed domain names were registered on 2 December 2025.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

As the Respondent did not file any response to the complaint, the Panel took into account the following facts asserted by the Complainant (and supported by the documentary evidence submitted by the Complainant) and unchallenged by the Respondent:

(a) the Complainant is a global leader in the animal health industry and part of family-owned Boehringer Ingelheim, founded in 1885. Complainant's products FRONTLINE/FRONTLINE PLUS are indicated for the treatment and prevention of fleas, ticks and chewing

lice in dogs and cats;

(b) the Complainant is the owner of Complainant’s Trademarks;

(c) the Complainant owns various domain names including the same verbal element FRONTLINE; and

(d) the disputed domain names resolve to generic webpages without any substantial content.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

THE COMPLAINANT:

In addition to the above factual assertions, the Complainant also contends the following:

(i) the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to Complainant's Trademarks because they incorporate such trademarks in their entirety. The inclusion of descriptive terms such as “PLUS,” “FOR CATS,” or “FOR DOGS” does not diminish the likelihood of confusion but rather reinforces it by referencing the Complainant’s specific product lines;

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names as the Respondent is not commonly known by the domain names in WHOIS records. There is no affiliation, license, or authorization between the parties, and the Respondent has never been authorized to use Complainant's Trademarks. Additionally, because the disputed domain names resolve to empty blog templates without substantive content, there is no evidence of a bona fide offering of goods or services or any legitimate non-commercial use of the disputed domain names; and

(iii) the disputed domain names were registered and used in bad faith, given the long-established reputation of the “FRONTLINE” trademark and previous panel decisions recognizing its well-known status. Given the specific use of terms that mirror the Complainant’s specialized pet products, it is inferred that the Respondent had full knowledge of the Complainant’s rights at the time of registration. Finally, the lack of any plausible legitimate use for the parked domain names suggests they were acquired for infringing purposes, such as passing off or consumer deception.

For these reasons, the Complainant seeks transfer of the disputed domain names to the Complainant.

THE RESPONDENT:

The Respondent did not provide any response to the complaint.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain names are 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 Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy ("**UDRP**" or "**Policy**").

For details, please see "Principal Reasons for the Decision".

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 names (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

For details, please see "Principal Reasons for the Decision".

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

For details, please see "Principal Reasons for the Decision".

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 requires that the Complainant proves each of the following three elements to obtain an order that the disputed domain name should be transferred or revoked:

(i) the disputed 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 in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel will proceed to analyze whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied in these proceedings.

RIGHTS

The disputed domain names include the distinctive word element of Complainant's Trademarks "FRONTLINE" in its entirety and therefore are confusingly similar to Complainant's Trademarks. The addition of non-distinctive/descriptive terms such as "plus" and "for dogs" / "for cats" does not diminish such confusing similarity.

For the sake of completeness, the Panel asserts that the top-level suffix in the domain name (i.e. the ".com") must be disregarded under the identity / confusing similarity test as it is a necessary technical requirement of registration.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Complainant satisfied the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

NO 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 a prima facie case is made, the Respondent carries the burden of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the Respondent fails to do so, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP (please see, for example, WIPO case no. D2003-0455, Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.).

The disputed domain names resolve to webpages showing some generic / probably AI generated content entirely unrelated to the FRONTLINE products of the Complainant, which can hardly be regarded as a bona fide offering of goods or services. As asserted by the Complainant (and unchallenged by the Respondent), the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. Neither is the Respondent in any way related to the Complainant. The Respondent failed to provide any information and evidence that it has relevant rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) (ii) of the Policy).

Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Respondent does not have any right or legitimate interest to the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has not presented evidence establishing any of the typical cases of bad faith in registration and use of the domain names listed in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy. Nevertheless, such a list is not exhaustive, and bad faith in registration and use of the disputed domain names may also be found in other cases, taking into account all relevant facts and circumstances of the case at hand (please see the WIPO case No. D2000-0003, Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows <telstra.org> and WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Second Edition, Section 3.2).

Here, the Panel noted that the Complainant is a well-known player in the animal health industry and the Complainant’s Trademarks enjoy a good reputation. Hence, the Panel is convinced that the denomination FRONTLINE is clearly distinctive to the Complainant and the Respondent registered the disputed domain names in full knowledge of the Complainant, Complainant's Trademarks and Complainant's FRONTLINE products. Otherwise, the Respondent would not have added the elements "for dogs" and "for cats," clearly referring to the intended use of Complainant's products to the disputed domain names. In this respect, the Panel also deems it appropriate to refer to paragraph 2 of the Policy under which it is the responsibility of the Respondent as the registrant of the disputed domain names to determine whether its registration infringes or violates someone else's rights.

In light of the above circumstances, the Panel failed to find any plausible good faith reasons for registration and use of the disputed

domain name by the Respondent. The Respondent has not submitted any response to the Complaint and therefore has not presented any facts or arguments that could counter the above conclusions of the Panel. As a result, the Panel holds that the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used by the Respondent in bad faith (within the meaning of 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. **frontlineplusforcats.com**: Transferred
2. **frontlineplusfordogs.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Michal Matějka**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-01-07

Publish the Decision