Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108382

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108382
Time of filing	2026-02-04 11:41:43
Domain names	horll.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Horl 1993 GmbH

Complainant representative

Organization	Grünecker Patent- und Rechtsanwälte PartGmbB

Respondent

Organization	Horl

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 owns trade mark registrations in various jurisdictions for its HORL mark including European trade mark registration 018099936 for HORL which was registered on 9 January 2020 and International Registration 1531837 registered on 23 January 2020.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, based in Germany, is a family-owned company that has for approximately 25 years manufactured products and provided systems for knife sharpening. The official website at its domain name <horl.com> promotes the Complainant's products and offers them for sale in Germany and in various other jurisdictions.

The disputed domain name was registered on 25 November 2026 by the Respondent based in Spain. It resolves to a website in English which features the HORL mark and depicts and appears to offer for sale the Complainant's branded products. This website features photographs of the Complainant's HORL products and of the Complainant's founders and in the terms and conditions states that the business is Horl Corporation and includes a contact e-mail address at "info@horll.com".

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 Complainant has submitted that it owns registered trade mark rights as set out above and that the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's HORL mark and is therefore confusingly similar to it. The Panel agrees and finds that the addition of a second "l" in the disputed domain name neither distinguishes it nor prevents a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant has submitted that the Respondent has not been authorised or permitted to use its HORL trade mark, that there is no relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent and neither is there any evidence that the Respondent is using or preparing to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, the Complainant has asserted that the disputed domain name is being used to confuse and divert Internet users to its own website at which it purports to masquerade as the Complainant and to offer its products for sale using the same or similar get up, product photos and text. The Complainant has also submitted evidence of its agent's attempt to make a test purchase of a product from the website at the disputed domain name. The payment for this order went through but no product was ever delivered which further indicates that the Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services from the website at the disputed domain name.

The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and accordingly the Panel finds that the Complainant has made out its case under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

As noted by the Complainant, the disputed domain name was registered on 25 November 2026 many years after the registration of the Complainant's HORL trade mark. The HORL mark is unusual and has a high level of distinctiveness for knife sharpening products. Considering also that the website at the disputed domain name contains the HORL mark, representations of the Complainant's products including its logo, various of the photographs from the Complainant's website and appears overall to masquerade as if it is the Complainant's website, it is most likely that the Spanish based Respondent was well aware of the Complainant's mark and business when he registered the disputed domain name.

Under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy there is evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith where a Respondent has used the disputed domain name to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trade marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of

the website.

The Panel agrees with the Complainant that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name, in what amounts to a case of typosquatting, to confuse and divert Internet users seeking the Complainant's website and products. Internet users arriving at the website at the disputed domain name could very well be confused into thinking that it is the Complainant's site as it has the look and feel of that site, the same or similar photographs, appears to offer the Complainant's products and features similar text and notably makes a representation that the products offered are provided by "Horl Corporation". None of this has been authorised by the Complainant and in addition there is evidence, as described above, to suggest that the Respondent also acts fraudulently in not even providing the products ordered and paid for through its website. This conduct clearly fulfils the requirements of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy and amounts to evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **horll.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Mr Alistair Payne**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-03-09

Publish the Decision