Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108383

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108383
Time of filing	2026-02-10 10:25:00
Domain names	silvercrests.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Lidl Stiftung & Co. KG

Complainant representative

Organization	HK2 Rechtsanwälte

Respondent

Name	Li Lin

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 of many « SILVERCREST » registered trademarks, including the following:

United States trademark SILVERCREST (word) registration No. 4293987, registered on February 26, 2013;

International trademark SILVERCREST (word) registration No. 1111060, registered on December 2, 2011;

European trademark SILVERCREST (word) registration No. 010221505, registered on May 16, 2012.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

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

The Complainant is one of the biggest supermarket chains in Europe, operating over 12,600 stores. Under the SILVERCREST brand, the Complainant sells small kitchen appliances such as kettles, air fryers, and similar products.

The Complainant promotes the SILVERCREST trademark via its own website, i.e, www.lidl.de.

The disputed domain name <silvercrests.com> was registered on November 24, 2025.

Currently, the disputed domain name resolves to a website where the SILVERCREST trademark is displayed and purported SILVERCREST-branded goods are promoted.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

The Complainant contends that:

1. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its distinctive trademark " SILVERCREST".

2. The Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name

The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and that the Respondent is not affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant in any way. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and is not related to the Complainant's business in any way. The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business dealings with, the Respondent.

The Complainant further affirms that the disputed domain name is used to impersonate the Complainant or at least to create the false impression of an affiliation with the Complainant, and that such conduct can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a Respondent.

3. The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith

The Complainant contends that it is inconceivable that the Respondent could have registered the disputed domain name without actual knowledge of the Complainant's rights in the SILVERCREST trademark.

In addition, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is deliberately trying to impersonate the Complainant in an attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain to its own website, where purported SILVERCREST-branded goods are offered.

The Complainant further affirms that the Respondent has used a privacy service to hide its identity and has provided, on its website, a non-existent physical address, and that these are evidence of bad faith.

RESPONDENT:

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

A) Confusing similarity

The disputed domain name contains the Complainant's registered trademark SILVERCREST in its entirety with the sole addition of the letter "s".

This Panel agrees with the Complainant's view, that this addition does not create a new or different right to the mark or diminish confusing similarity.

B) Lack of legitimate rights or interests

The disputed domain name is a distinctive, non-descriptive name. It is unlikely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without having the Complainant firmly in mind. The Respondent does not appear to engage in any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, nor any use in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. In fact, it appears that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name for an unauthorised website displaying the Complainant's trademark and offering purported SILVERCREST-branded goods in what appears to be an attempt to impersonate the Complainant. The Panel thus notes that the composition and use of the disputed domain name creates a likelihood of confusion as to the Respondent's relationship with the Complainant (where there is none). The Complainant's assertions that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and is not affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant are sufficient to constitute a prima facie demonstration of the absence of rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name on the part of the Respondent. The burden of evidence therefore shifts to the Respondent to show, using tangible evidence, that it does have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has made no attempt to do so.

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

C) Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant gives sound bases for its contention that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith.

Firstly, owing to the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark, and the use of the disputed domain name to resolve to a website displaying the Complainant's trademark and offering purported SILVERCREST-branded goods, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark, and so the Panel finds on the balance of probabilities that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademarks when registering the disputed domain name.

Secondly, the Panel accepts the Complainant's unchallenged assertion that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the aim of creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark. In fact, the disputed domain name appears to have been used to attract internet users while impersonating the Complainant.

Thirdly, it appears that the Respondent has used a privacy service and has provided, on its website, a non-existent physical address. This behaviour is further evidence of bad faith.

Finally, the Respondent has not responded to nor denied any of the assertions made by the Complainant in this proceeding.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **silvercrests.com** : Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Fabrizio Bedarida**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-03-06

Publish the Decision