Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108410

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108410
Time of filing	2026-02-18 09:29:50
Domain names	babbel-eng.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Babbel GmbH

Complainant representative

Organization	Lubberger Lehment Rechtsanwälte Partnerschaft mbB

Respondent

Name	Adi Wils

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 the BABBEL trademark in different jurisdictions around the world. By way of example, the German Trademark (DPMA) registration No. 30770566, registered on March 13, 2008, or the International trademark (WIPO) registration No. 1248282, registered on March 12, 2015.

The Panel recognizes the distinctive and well-known character of Complainant´s BABBEL trademark.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a German company set up in 2007, providing language-learning services via its platform and app. In 2025 the Complainant has already sold over 25 million paying subscriptions for its app worldwide.

The Complainant´s main site is www.babbel.com where it advertises and offers its services.

The disputed domain name < babbel-eng.com > was registered on 29 October 2025 and redirected to a website offering learning services under the brand name “Babbel”. Currently the disputed domain name diverts to an online casino in Egypt.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

THE COMPLAINANT

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it.

The Complainant alleges that BABBEL´s registered mark forms the distinctive part of the disputed domain name, and it is only added by a descriptive element “-eng”. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is to be considered confusingly similar to the registered mark

The Complainant also asserts that the Respondent has not been commonly known by the domain name, is not the owner of a trademark for the term “Babbel” and the Complainant has no relationship with the Respondent. Neither the Complainant has authorized the Respondent to use the mark BABBEL on a website or, as a domain name. Besides, the disputed domain name redirects to a site offering services in competition with those of the Complainant and under the BABBEL trademark.

With regard to the third requirement, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is trying to disrupt a competitor as well as to attract, for commercial gain, internet users to a website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of a website or of a product or service on a website or location.

The Complainant also notes that the Respondent is giving the false impression that it is an official platform of the Complainant when offering its services on the corresponding site or, by reproducing BABBEL in the disputed domain name.

THE 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

1. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the BABBEL trademark for the purposes of the Policy. From a comparison between the disputed domain name and the Complainant´s trademark it seems clear that the former reproduces the mark BABBEL. The Respondent simply added a hyphen and the abbreviation for “english”, that is to say “eng”.

The applicable Top-Level Domain (‘TLD’) in a domain name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element test.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

2. Rights or Legitimate Interest

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy sets out non-exclusive examples in which the Respondent may establish rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. However, while the burden of proof in UDRP proceedings rests on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often-impossible task of “proving a negative”. Accordingly, panels have established, since the inception of the UDRP, that it is sufficient to raise a prima facie case against the respondent and then the evidential burden of production shifts to the respondent. See CAC-UDRP-106452

The Panel finds that the circumstances referred to in paragraph 4(c) do not apply to the Respondent or, even any other legitimate circumstance that may apply in favour of the Respondent. Indeed, the composition of the disputed domain name suggests impersonation which cannot grant rights or legitimate interests.

The Panel finds that the clear intent of the Respondent was to arise as someone associated with the Complainant while such an association or relation does not exist. Thus, the Panel cannot find rights or legal interest for the Respondent.

Besides, the silence of the Respondent and the redirection of the disputed domain name to an online casino, once he received the Complaint, has prevented the Panel from assessing if any circumstances may oppose the Complainant´s prima facie showing.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

3. Register and Used in Bad Faith

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent falls in the circumstances set out in paragraph 4(b) (iv) of the Policy. That is to say, the disputed domain name attempts to bait the Internet users into a website which they might think is an official site of the Complainant when this is not the case.

Noting that bad faith under the UDRP is broadly understood to occur where a respondent takes unfair advantage of or otherwise abuses a complainant’s mark, the Panel accepts that paragraph 4(b)(iii) of the Policy also applies in this case. Indeed, the website to which the disputed domain name redirects offering similar services leads the Panel to conclude that the Respondent is taking unfair advantage of the Complainant and its trademark. Thus, the Respondent is disrupting the business of a competitor.

On balance, the Respondent knew about the Complainant and its trademarks when registering the disputed domain name <babbel-eng.com> due to its reputation and distinctiveness in the educational industry.

Arguably, the lack of a credible explanation for the Respondent’s choice of the domain name and the current redirection to an online casino in Egypt support a finding of bad faith use and registration.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **babbel-eng.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Manuel Moreno-Torres**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-03-13

Publish the Decision