Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108217

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108217
Time of filing	2026-01-19 13:08:10
Domain names	siemens-healthiniers.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Siemens Trademark GmbH & Co. KG

Respondent

Organization	THenry consultant

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

- International Registration No. 1357232 “SIEMENS Healthineers” (fig.) of October 25, 2016, in the name of Siemens Trademark GmbH & Co. KG, designating various territories and claiming protection for goods and services in classes 5, 9, 10, 35, 37, 42 and 44. (see Annex 1 for the detailed list of goods and services).
- International registration No. 637074 “SIEMENS” of March 31, 1995 in the name of Siemens Trademark GmbH & Co. KG, covering more than 60 countries worldwide and claiming protection for goods and services in international classes 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21, 28, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41 and 42 (see Annex 1 for the detailed list of goods and services).

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is part of the Siemens Group, headquartered in Berlin and Munich, one of the world’s largest corporations, providing innovative technologies and comprehensive know-how to benefit customers in 190 countries.

Founded more than 175 years ago, the company is active - to name but a few examples - in the fields of Medicine, Automation and Control, Power, Transportation, Logistics, Information and Communications, etc.

The turnover of the Siemens Group in 2024 was 75.9 billion Euro, and the group employs more than 310.000 people worldwide. The Complainant has a wide presence in the Internet, owning several domain names, such as its global website <siemens.com>, <siemens.eu>, <siemens.de>, <siemens-healthineers.com>.

The disputed domain name <siemens-healthiniers.com> was registered in December 6, 2025.

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

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed the Complainant must show and satisfy the Panel that: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and (iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has rights in the SIEMENS and SIEMENS HEALTHINEERS marks.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's SIEMENS and the SIEMENS HEALTHINEERS trademarks in their entirety, with the sole exception for the mispelling of the element "Healthineers" in the second trademark of the Complainant.

The Panel considers that said misspelling of "Healthineers" is a typical case of "typosquatting" where the disputed domain name is merely one letter different from the Complainants' trademark, and finds that the disputed domain is confusingly similar to the Complainant's "SIEMENS" and "SIEMENS Healthineers". (See similar cases, e.g. as CAC-UDRP-107650 – finding the domain name <siemens-healthineerss.com> confusingly similar to the Complainant's "SIEMENS" and "SIEMENS Healthineers" trademarks); CAC-UDRP-106929 – finding the domain name <siemens-helthineers.com> confusingly similar to the Complainant's "SIEMENS" and "SIEMENS Healthineers" trademarks); as well as Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.0"), paragraph 1.9, a domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element).

In this respect, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the marks SIEMENS and SIEMENS HEALTHINEERS, in which the Complainant has rights, and thus paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant contends that the Respondent lacks any authorization to use the SIEMENS or SIEMENS HEALTHINEERS trademarks and maintains no affiliation with the Complainant. The Panel also finds that the respondent has not been nor is it been commonly known with this disputed domain name.

As per the use, this Panel notes that the disputed domain name does not show any content. However, the Complainant provided evidence that connected e-mail-addresses(es) with the disputed domain name were used for misleading Internet users and Complainants partners, requesting them for fraudulent payments. This Panel finds that the Respondent is not using the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

This Panel concludes that the Complainants have sufficiently demonstrated, without the same being answered nor rebutted, that the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has fulfilled the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes the Complainants contentions, and confirms that the well-known and extensively used “SIEMENS” trademark worldwide significantly precedes the registration of the domain name <siemens-healthiniers.com>. It seems therefore obvious that the Respondent was well aware of the existence of the Complainants trademark, whose reputation has been already addressed in various UDRP decisions (e.g. WIPO Case No. D2013-0923, Siemens AG v. Mr. Ozgul Fatih, WIPO Case No. D2010-1771 and Siemens AG, Nokia Siemens Networks Oy v. Chen Fang Fang, WIPO Case No. D2008-1908).

The Panel finds that the Respondent deliberately choose and registered the disputed domain name “siemens-healthiniers.com”, with a typo, which contains the famous trademark “SIEMENS” and the Complainant’s combined trademark “SIEMENS Healthineers” in a highly similar manner.

As per the use, this Panel notes that the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website. However, the intentions of the Respondent are clear. As shown by the evidence provided by the Complaint, the Respondent has not limited itself in the passive registration of this domain name, but has rather taken active steps into misleading Siemens partners, using the disputed domain name to send fraudulent e-mails and requesting payments to e-mail address(es) connected with the disputed domain name, while impersonating the Complainant.

The Panel finds that the Respondent, through this scheme, has intentionally attempted to attract for commercial gain Internet users to disputed domain name by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant’s trademarks (See Migros-Genossenschafts-Bund v. WhoisGuard Protected, WhoisGuard, Inc. / Jasmine Julius, WIPO Case No. D2020-0327 and WIPO Case No. D2019-0149, where impersonating a Complainant with e-mail scams has been found as clear evidence of bad faith registration and use).

For all the above, this Panel concludes that the disputed domain name 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. **siemens-healthiniers.com** : Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Laura Martin-Gamero Schmidt**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-03-04

Publish the Decision