Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108345

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108345
Time of filing	2026-01-23 08:35:26
Domain names	man-eu.online

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	MAN Truck & Bus SE

Complainant representative

Organization	Grünecker Patent und Rechtsanwälte PartG mbB

Respondent

Name	Hurnil Jessy

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 is the owner, inter alia, of the German Trademark Registration No. 1145272, MAN, registered in 1989 in International Classes 7, 12, and 37, and of the international Registration No. 1019087A MAN (fig.) registered in 2009 in International Classes 07, 12, 16, 25, 28, 35, 37 and 39, designating 34 jurisdictions.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

FACTS ASSERTED BY THE COMPLAINANT AND NOT CONTESTED BY THE RESPONDENT:

The Complainant – a leading Germany manufacturer of trucks and busses established in 1908, which distributes a wide range of commercial vehicles with 33,000 employees worldwide and an annual sales revenue of around 13.7 billion Euros – owns a wide portfolio of brands for the MAN trademark.

The Respondent has registered the disputed domain name <man-eu.online> on March 31, 2025, which, as of this day, resolves to an inactive page.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

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

THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME IS IDENTICAL OR CONFUSINGLY SIMILAR TO THE COMPLAINANT`S TRADEMARK

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark “MAN” registered by the Complainant in a great number of jurisdictions worldwide, which has proven to have prior rights since 1989.

In particular, the Panel agrees that the mere addition of letters "EU" (likely a geographical reference to the European Union) is not sufficient to avoid the confusing similarity of the disputed domain with the trademark MAN, which has been cited in the past as a well-known mark by relevant UDRP case-law.

THE RESPONDENT HAS NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS IN RESPECT OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME

According to the information provided by the Complainant, the Respondent is not affiliated nor authorized by the Complainant in any way. Likewise, the Complainant neither licensed nor authorized the Respondent to make any use of its trademark “MAN”, or to apply for registration of the disputed domain name on behalf of the Complainant. The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent.

It is undeniable that Complainant is only required to make out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. Once such prima facie case is made, 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 Policy.

Given all the above and taken into account the fact that the Respondent did not provide any response within the present proceeding, the Panel accepts the contentions of the Complainant that the Respondent has no such rights or legitimate interests in <man-eu.online>.

THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME HAS BEEN REGISTERED AND IS BEING USED IN BAD FAITH

The Panel finds that the Complainant successfully submitted prima facie evidence that the Respondent has made no use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, of the disputed domain name neither in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor is making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain name comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith.

In the absence of a response from Hurnil Jessy and given the reputation of the Complainant and its trademark, the Panel infers that the Respondent had the Complainant's trademarks "MAN" in mind when registering the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, even though there is no active website associated with the disputed domain name, this does not preclude a finding of bad faith under passive holding doctrine, which include the following factors to be taken into account, among others, (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, (iii) the implausibility of any good faith use to which the domain name may be put (See Article 3.3 of the WIPO Jurisprudence Overview 3.0).

In the circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that the Complainant's trademark has a high degree of inherent distinctiveness and reputation and that the Respondent has not provided any response or evidence of actual or intended use in good faith, nor with a plausible explanation about why the disputed domain name has been registered.

Consequently, the Panel believes that the same was registered and is being used in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **man-eu.online**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Tommaso La Scala**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-02-26

Publish the Decision