Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108376

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108376
Time of filing	2026-02-03 10:16:52
Domain names	boehrngers-ingelheim.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	Apex Network Solutions LLC

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 proved to be the owner of the International trademark BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM reg. no. 568844 registered since March 22, 1991. The Complainant also owns the domain name <boehringer-ingelheim.com> registered since January 1, 1995.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a German family-owned pharmaceutical group of companies with roots going back to 1885, when it was founded by Albert Boehringer (1861-1939) in Ingelheim am Rhein.

The Complainant owns a large trademark portfolio including the trademark "BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM" protected in several countries, including the international registration no. 568844 registered since March 22, 1991

The Complainant also owns numerous domain names incorporating "BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM" including <boehringer-ingelheim.com> registered in September 1st, 1995.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 28, 2026 and resolves to a parking page with commercial links.

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 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. The disputed domain names are confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant has successfully proved to be the owner of the trademark BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM and of the domain name <boehringer-ingelheim.com> registered since 1995-09-01.

The disputed domain name is composed of the element "boehrngers-ingelheim.com". The Panel finds that the trademark “BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM” is fully recognizable in the disputed domain name and that the deletion of the letter "I" and the addition of the letter "S" in the disputed domain name has no significant impact on the confusing similarity assessment.

According to a consolidated case law in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in it, the confusing similarity threshold is met.

Furthermore, the addition of “.com” is generally disregarded in view of its technical function.

As a consequence, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks, for the purposes of the First Element of the Policy.

2. The Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

Pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, a complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Once such a prima facie case is made, the respondent carries the burden of demonstrating its 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.

In this case, the Panel finds that the Complainant’s submitted evidence and allegations are sufficient to establish a prima facie case

of the Respondent’s lack of rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

According to the information provided by the Complainant and not contested by the Respondent, Apex Network Solutions LLC is not commonly known by the disputed domain name nor it is authorized to use the Complainant’s trademarks.

Additionally, the disputed domain name links to a PPC webpage and such links are related to the Complainant's business.

The Panel finds that such use discloses an absence of a bona fide offering of goods or services and of a legitimate noncommercial/ fair use of the disputed domain name. In the view of the Panel, given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademarks, the sponsored links are used by the Respondent to capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the "BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM" trademark.

For these reasons, the Panel takes the view that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names for the purposes of the Policy.

3. The disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

The Panel finds the following circumstances as material in order to establish the Respondent's bad faith in the registration of the disputed domain name:

(i) the disputed domain name was registered well after the Complainant acquired rights on the trademark BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM;

(ii) the Complainant's trademark is widely known as confirmed by previous Panels (CAC Case No. 102274). The reputation of the trademark BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM makes it very improbable that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant's exclusive rights on the trademark at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name;

(iii) the disputed domain name is a clear and obvious misspelling of the Complainant's trademark (i.e. typosquatting).

Previous panels found that typosquatting discloses an intention on the part of the respondent to confuse users seeking or expecting to find a website related to the complainant.

As regards use in bad faith, the disputed domain name currently resolves to PPC webpages. The links sponsored through the disputed domain names are partially related to the Complainant's business and, in any case, they are not justified by a descriptive meaning of the words composing the disputed domain name. As a consequence the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is used to exploit the reputation and distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark for the Respondent's commercial gain and such use is considered in bad faith,

In addition the Complainant proved that MX records are active in the disputed domain name. This element is an additional index of use in bad faith.

All above considered the Panel finds the evidence submitted as sufficient to prove use and registration of the disputed domain name in bad faith for the purposes of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **boehrngers-ingelheim.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Andrea Mascetti**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-03-05

Publish the Decision