Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108351

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108351
Time of filing	2026-01-30 07:52:10
Domain names	siemens318.com, siemens298.com, siemens299.com, siemens300.com, siemens301.com, siemens302.com, siemens303.com , siemens304.com, siemens305.com, siemens306.com, siemens307.com, siemens308.com, siemens309.com, siemens310.com, siemens311.com, siemens312.com, siemens313.com, siemens314.com, siemens316.com, siemens317.com, siemens2.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Siemens Trademark GmbH & Co. KG

Complainant representative

Organization	Coöperatie SNB-REACT U.A.

Respondents

Name	· ·
Organization	a shi da shi da shi d a shi da shi

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’s trademark rights in SIEMENS date back to at least 1986.

The Complainant’s trademark registrations include:

- International Registration No. 504324, registered on April 7, 1986;
- International Registration No. 637074, registered on March 31, 1995; and
- European Registration No. 004240263, registered on January 14, 2005.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a trademark holding company, licensing the trade marks within Siemens Group.

Siemens is a technology group founded more than 175 years ago and is active across 190 countries. It focuses on the areas of automation and digitalisation in the process and manufacturing industries, intelligent infrastructure for buildings and distributed energy systems, smart mobility solutions for rail transport, and medical technology and digital healthcare services.

As of September 30, 2024, Siemens had around 327,000 employees. In 2024, Siemens Group's revenue was 75.9 billion Euros and its net income was 9 billion Euros.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain names on June 17, 2025, save for <siemens2.com> which was registered on June 16, 2025. At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain names resolved to inactive webpages.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain names should be transferred to it.
No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

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 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 names (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 names have been registered and are being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for only one of the disputed domain names, namely <siemens2.com>, is Chinese. The language of the Registration Agreement for the remaining disputed domain names is English.

Pursuant to the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceedings in relation to the domain name <siemens2.com> be English since the Registration Agreement for the remaining 20 disputed domain names is in English. Further, the disputed domain names are all formed by words in the Latin script and not in Chinese characters, and they are in the international ".com zone". Requiring the Complainant to translate the Complaint into Chinese would impose an undue burden on the Complainant and delay the proceeding.

The Respondent did not make any submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.0"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered the circumstances of this case including the composition of the disputed domain names which contains the

name “Siemens” which is in Latin characters, and the generic Top-Level Domain “com” which applies to all of the disputed domain names, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding for the domain name <siemens2.com> shall be English. There does not appear to be any reason which warrants a delay and additional expense in ordering the Complainant to translate the Complaint in relation to the domain name <siemens2.com>.

Other procedural matters

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 trade mark or service mark in which the complainant has rights.

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

In this case, the disputed domain names comprise the entirety of the Complainant’s SIEMENS trade mark with the addition of a series of numerals, a substantial portion of which are in running order.

It is well-established that where the relevant trade mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. (See WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0, section 1.8.).

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Complainant has shown that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to a trade mark in which the Complainant has rights.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Once a complainant establishes a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to show that it has rights or legitimate interests in respect to the disputed domain name (see WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0, section 2.1).

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

The Complainant has provided evidence that it owns registered trademark rights in SIEMENS mark long before the date that the disputed domain names were registered. Further, there is no evidence that the Respondent was licensed or otherwise authorized by the Complainant to use the Complainant’s SIEMENS trade mark, that the Respondent owned trademark rights in SIEMENS, or that he has been commonly known by the disputed domain names.

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 names which would be sufficient to rebut the Complainant’s prima facie case.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant must also show that the respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith (see 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 SIEMENS trade mark is without doubt well-known across the world and it would be implausible that the Respondent did not know of the Complainant and its SIEMENS trade mark at the time of registering the multiple domain names incorporating the trade mark. The Respondent obviously recognized the value of the SIEMENS trade mark and therefore targeted the Complainant and its trade mark. This is clearly borne out by the pattern of abusive domain name registrations, all of which were registered over two days.

As is stated in section 3.1.4 of the WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.0,

“Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a well-known trademark, and particularly in the case of coined or fanciful marks, can by itself create a presumption of bad faith.“

The fact that the disputed domain names resolved to inactive webpages does not absolve the Respondent from his acts of cybersquatting. Under the doctrine of passive holding, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names have been registered and

used in bad faith. In line with WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.3, the factors the Panel has considered the degree of distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's SIEMENS trade mark, the composition of the disputed domain names, the absence of any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, and the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use.

The Respondent, unsurprisingly, failed to submit a response and did not provide any explanation for registering the disputed domain names or any evidence of good-faith use.

Accordingly, having regard to the circumstances of this particular case, the Panel finds that the Complainant has met its burden under 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. **siemens318.com**: Transferred
2. **siemens298.com**: Transferred
3. **siemens299.com**: Transferred
4. **siemens300.com**: Transferred
5. **siemens301.com**: Transferred
6. **siemens302.com**: Transferred
7. **siemens303.com** : Transferred
8. **siemens304.com**: Transferred
9. **siemens305.com**: Transferred
10. **siemens306.com**: Transferred
11. **siemens307.com**: Transferred
12. **siemens308.com**: Transferred
13. **siemens309.com**: Transferred
14. **siemens310.com**: Transferred
15. **siemens311.com**: Transferred
16. **siemens312.com**: Transferred
17. **siemens313.com**: Transferred
18. **siemens314.com**: Transferred
19. **siemens316.com**: Transferred
20. **siemens317.com**: Transferred
21. **siemens2.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Francine Tan**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-02-25

Publish the Decision