Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108386

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108386
Time of filing	2026-02-11 13:54:25
Domain names	skoda-iran.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Škoda Auto a.s.

Complainant representative

Name	JUDr. Jiří Čermák advokát

Respondent

Name	sma manzeh

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 several trademarks consisting of the word element “Škoda” and “Skoda” such as:

- International trademark for “SKODA” No. 1476367 of November 30, 2018 inter alia for class 12;
- International trademark for “ŠKODA” No. 1365585 of April 7, 2017 for class 12;
- EU figurative trademark for 017874242 of August 19, 2022 inter alia for class 12;
- Iranian national trademark for “SKODA” No. 82111010 of January 16, 2005 for class 12.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant is the largest automobile manufacturer, largest company and largest exporter in the Czech Republic. It is also one of the countries' most significant employers. The Complainant exports vehicles to numerous markets worldwide and maintains sales agencies across Europe, Asia, Africa, South America and Oceania.

The disputed domain name has been created by the Respondent on December 17, 2024. Until May 20, 2025, the domain name linked to a website that presented itself as a commercial portal for Škoda automobiles in Iran. Since May 20, 2025 the domain name redirects to <parsatter.com> with similar content.

Both websites include the statement "Authorized Škoda dealers" in Persian language at the bottom of the website. And both websites use photographs of Škoda automobiles, some even copied from the Complainant's official website.

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

As the Respondent did not file an administratively compliant Response, pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), the Panel may draw such conclusions therefrom as it considers appropriate. The Panel accepts the contentions of the Complainant as admitted by the Respondent.

Taking the statements and documents submitted by the Complainant under careful consideration, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has established all the elements entitling it to claim the transfer of the disputed domain name.

I. Identical or Confusingly Similar disputed domain name

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name to be confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy”).

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown that it has valid trademark rights in “SKODA”.

The disputed domain name includes the Complainant's trademarks in its entirety. the word “SKODA” has no inherent meaning and is therefore associated exclusively with the Complainant. Additionally, the domain name includes a hyphen and the term “IRAN”.

Where a domain name incorporates a trademark in its entirety, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark (WIPO Case No. D2020-2410 – Bentley Motors Limited v. Domain Admin / Kyle Rocheleau, Privacy Hero Inc. among others). The addition of the term “IRAN” refers to the country and is therefore descriptive. The addition of such a common descriptive term and the separation of the words using a hyphen do not prevent the confusing similarity.

Lastly, the addition of the gTLD suffix “.COM” is not sufficient to escape the finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks and does not change the overall impression of the designation as being connected to the trademarks of the Complainant.

II. The Respondent’s Rights or Legitimate Interests in the disputed domain name

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, demonstrated that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings lies with the Complainant, the burden of proof shifts to the Respondent where the Complainant establishes a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. If the Respondent fails to provide evidence for its rights or legitimate interests, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy (WIPO Case No. D2004-0110 – Belupo d.d. v. WACHEM d.o.o.; WIPO case no. D2003-0455 – Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.).

The Complainant has established a prima facie proof that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, since the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant nor has the Complainant granted any permission or consent to use its trademarks in a domain name. Further, the disputed domain name does not correspond to the name of the Respondent, nor is the Respondent commonly known as “SKODA”.

The disputed domain name is also not being used for a “bona fide” offering of goods or services. This would, e.g., require the site to accurately disclose the registrant’s relationship with the trademark owner. This is not the case, since the Respondent untruthfully claims to be an “Authorized Škoda dealer” on both the old and the new redirected websites, which is not correct.

Summarised, Complainant has established the necessary prima facie proof that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests. In particular, the Complainant has established that the site is not used for a “bona fide” offering of its goods. Therefore, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

III. The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in Bad Faith

The Respondent has also registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of para. 4 (a)(iii) of the Policy by intentionally attempting to attract internet users to their website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark for commercial gain.

The Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of para. 4 (a)(iii).

The Complainant’s business introduced its first “Škoda” branded automobile in 1928 and has been an internationally successful automobile manufacturer using this trademark for decades. The word “Skoda” has no inherent meaning and is therefore associated exclusively with the Complainant. It is implausible, that the Respondent would have registered the domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its trademarks.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of para. 4 (a)(iii) of the Policy.

The Respondent is using the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of para. 4 (a)(iii).

The disputed domain name currently redirects the user to the domain <parsatter.com>. The site linked to this domain name, presents itself as a website run by “Authorized Škoda dealers” and supposedly offers Škoda automotives for sale. The whole website gives the impression of an official Škoda-website. The Persian language of the website fits the disputed domain name that refers to Iran. Thus, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its web site, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website.

Thus, the domain name itself is being used to attract internet users to the website <parsatter.com>, which constitutes a case of bad faith under para. 4 (a)(iii) of the Policy.

The Panel concludes that the holding and use of the domain name constitute a case of bad faith under 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. **skoda-iran.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Dominik Eickemeier**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-03-11

Publish the Decision