Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107644

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107644
Time of filing	2026-01-29 14:29:33
Domain names	lindt-digital.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Chocoladefabriken Lindt & Sprüngli AG

Complainant representative

Organization	SILKA AB

Respondent

Organization	Irene T Pickens

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

Chocoladefabriken Lindt & Sprüngli AG (the "Complainant") is the owner of the European Union trademark LINDT, registered on September 7, 1998 (Reg. No. 134007), in class 30. There are many other national and international registrations of this trademark.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, founded in 1845, is globally well-known as the leading premium quality chocolate maker based in Switzerland. It is the owner of the European Union trademark LINDT, registered on September 7, 1998 (Reg. No. 134007), in class 30, and there are many other national and international registrations of this trademark. The Complainant also owns domain names containing the trademark LINDT, such as the domain names <lindt.com>, <lindt.ch>, <lindt.cn>, etc.

The disputed domain name <lindt-digital.com> was registered on December 1, 2025, i.e. many years after the first registration of the Complainant's LINDT globally well-known trademark, and resolved to one of the Lindt's official websites (https://www.lindt.ch/de/), aimed at the Swiss market. The disputed domain name has been configured with an active MX (mail exchange) record, indicating that it supports email functionality. On December 19, 2025, the Complainant's authorized representatives sent a notice by email to the Respondent, followed by a reminder on December 26, 2025. The Respondent did not reply to either communication. The registration data also shows that the Respondent used false contact details.

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

The Panel agrees with the Complainant that the disputed domain name <lindt-digital.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark LINDT. The evidence presented by the Complainant shows the extensive use of its trademark internationally and it is, therefore, regarded as a well-known trademark. The Panel agrees with the Complainant that the addition of the hyphen and the word “digital” to the well-known sign does not set aside the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark (see section 1.8 of WIPO Overview 3.0). On the contrary, the addition of the term “digital” refers directly to the Complainant’s online sales and marketing of its production.

The Panel acknowledges that the Complainant presented prima facie evidence that the Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with Complainant in any way. Furthermore, the Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or permitted Respondent to use Complainant’s trademarks in any manner, including in domain names. The Respondent's name does not resemble the disputed domain name in any manner. Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use. On these bases, the Panel concludes that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in regard to the disputed domain name.

As no administratively compliant response has been provided to the Panel and the prima facie evidence was not challenged by the Respondent, the Panel concludes that the Respondent meant Complainant's trademark LINDT, when he/she registered the disputed domain name <lindt-digital.com> (see WIPO Overview 3.0, para. 3.1.3 and 3.2). Previous UDRP panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

The disputed domain name was used to resolve to one of the Lindt’s official websites (https://www.lindt.ch/de/), aimed at the Swiss market. A finding that a Respondent has registered a domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark is supported by the evidenced showing redirection of the disputed domain name to the Complainant’s website (WIPO Overview 3.0, para. 3.1.4). At the same time, this disputed domain name has been configured with an active MX (mail exchange) record, indicating that it supports email functionality. Evidently, such a configuration created a clear risk that the Respondent could use the disputed domain name to send deceptive emails for phishing, impersonation, or other fraudulent purposes. Finally, on December 19, 2025, the Complainant’s authorized representatives sent a

notice by email to the Respondent, followed by a reminder on December 26, 2025. The Respondent did not reply to either communication. All the above, taken together, including the notoriety of the Complainant's trademark, the failure of the Respondent to reply to a cease and desist letter and to submit a response in this UDRP proceeding, Respondent's use of false contact details and the implausibility of any good faith use, leads to the Panel's conclusion that the disputed domain name was used in bad faith (section 3.3 of WIPO Overview 3.0).

In view of the foregoing, the Panel has concluded that the disputed domain name was, both, registered and used in bad faith (Para. 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. **lindt-digital.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Darius Sauliūnas**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-03-09

Publish the Decision