Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108290

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108290
Time of filing	2025-12-30 10:38:54
Domain names	boehringer-ingelheim-india.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Boehringer Ingelheim Pharma GmbH & Co.KG

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Organization	boehringer ingelheim india limited

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 relies on:

- International Registration no. 221544 in respect of a figurative mark comprising "Boehringer-Ingelheim" in classes 1-6, 16, 17, 19, 29, 30 and 32, registered on July 2, 1959
- International Registration no. 568844 in respect of a figurative mark comprising "Boehringer-Ingelheim" in classes 1-5, 9, 10, 16, 30 and 31, registered on March 22, 1991.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant's business was founded by Albert Boehringer in Ingelheim am Rhein in 1865. It is now a global, research-driven pharmaceutical enterprise with 54,500 employees and net annual sales of nearly 27 billion Euros.

The Complainant is the proprietor of the registered trademarks detailed above as well as multiple domain names containing "boehringer" and "ingelheim", including boehringer-ingelheim.com, registered on 1 September 1995.

The disputed domain name, boehringer-ingelheim-india.com, was registered on 27 December 2025 and resolves to a parking page. MX servers are configured.

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.

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

RIGHTS

The Panel finds that the Complainant has registered rights in figurative marks comprising "Boehringer-Ingelheim". The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name comprises the distinctive element of these marks together with the geographic name, India, and the generic top level domain suffix, .com, which are insufficient to avert the likelihood of confusion. The Panel considers that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to these marks.

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to trademarks in which the Complainant has rights within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Panel finds on the undisputed evidence that the Respondent has not used or made preparations to use the disputed domain name or any corresponding name for any bona fide offering of goods or services or for any legitimate non-commercial or fair use. The Panel is also satisfied on the evidence that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name or any corresponding name and has not been authorised by the Complainant to use any such name.

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

Given the distinctiveness and very extensive use of the Complainant's marks and the composition of the disputed domain name comprising their distinctive element together with wholly descriptive or generic elements, the Panel infers that the Respondent knew of the Complainant's marks when registering the disputed domain name and chose to register a domain name that was confusingly similar to them.

Moreover, it very difficult to conceive of any bona fide use of the disputed domain name without the Complainant's consent and none has been suggested, let alone substantiated. In these circumstances the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown that 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

The disputed domain name consists of a distinctive element of the Complainants´ well-known mark together with a descriptive geographic term and the general top-level domain name suffix. There is no evidence of legitimate use of the disputed domain name or any corresponding name and the Respondent has not provided any justification for registering it. The Panel finds that the disputed domain is confusingly similar to the Complainant's registered marks, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests, and that it was registered and is being used in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **boehringer-ingelheim-india.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Jonathan Turner**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-02-16

Publish the Decision