Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108445

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108445
Time of filing	2026-02-27 11:27:08
Domain names	sudocrem.shop

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Norton Creams Limited

Complainant representative

Organization	SILKA AB

Respondent

Name	Abdul Rehman Azeem

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 registered owner of several trademarks for the word “SUDOCREM”, including EU trademark registration no. 000239442, registered on 2 October 2000 in classes 3 and 5, and Australian trademark registration no. 250234, registered on 20 July 1971 in class 5 (hereinafter referred to as the "Trademarks").

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant markets a healing cream under the Trademarks. The product’s origins trace back to 1931, and it is today available in over 50 countries worldwide. The Complainant maintains an official online presence for the SUDOCREM brand through multiple country-specific websites and is, inter alia, the registered owner of "sudocrem.com".

The disputed domain name was registered on 2 January 2026 and was used in connection with a website offering SUDOCREM-branded products for sale. The website prominently featured the Complainant's stylised and coloured SUDOCREM logo.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is identical to the Trademarks, as it consists solely of the Trademarks. The Complainant also contends that the TLD ".shop" is a standard registration requirement and should, therefore, be disregarded.

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in relation to the disputed domain name. It submits that the Respondent does not have trademark rights for, nor is it commonly known by, the Trademarks or any similar term, and that the Respondent is not connected to, nor affiliated with, the Complainant and has not received a license or consent to use the Trademarks in any way. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has not used, nor prepared to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate non-commercial or fair use. The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name has been used in connection with a website that impersonated the Complainant by falsely presenting itself as an official online store, prominently displaying the Complainant's logo and images of SUDOCREM-branded items offered at discounted prices. In this context, the Complainant also states that even if the Respondent were to contend that it was acting as a reseller, such use would fail to satisfy the cumulative Oki Data criteria, as the Respondent did not accurately and prominently disclose its lack of relationship with the Complainant.

With regard to the question of bad faith, the Complainant states that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It claims that the Trademarks have developed substantial goodwill and recognition over many decades and that the Respondent specifically targeted the Trademarks at the time of registration. The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name consists exclusively of the Trademarks and that there is no plausible explanation for the Respondent’s selection of this exact string other than to capitalise on the Complainant’s goodwill and to create a false impression of source, sponsorship, or affiliation. The Complainant further points to the fact that a highly similar domain name, "sudocrem.pk", was registered on the very same date as the disputed domain name, resolves to materially identical website content, and is evidence that the Respondent is acting in a pattern of abusive conduct targeting the Trademarks. With regard to bad faith use, the Complainant states that, by using the disputed domain name in the way outlined above, the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to his website or other online location by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of his website or location or of a product or service on his website or location, as set out in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the following three elements is present:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; and

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

1. The Panel accepts that the disputed domain name is identical to the Trademarks, as the second level of the disputed domain name comprises the Trademarks alone. It is well established that the specific top-level domain name is generally not an element of distinctiveness that can be taken into consideration when evaluating the identity or confusing similarity between the complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name.

2. The Complainant has substantiated that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that the Complainant has fulfilled its obligations under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. The Respondent did not deny these assertions in any way and therefore failed to prove any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Based on the evidence on file, the Panel cannot find any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent either, as the disputed domain name is not generic and the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name does not appear to indicate the existence of any rights or legitimate interests of its own. In particular, the Respondent's website does not include any kind of disclaimer to clarify that the website is not endorsed or sponsored by the Complainant and therefore does not meet the Oki Data criteria, even if the products offered at the disputed domain name are assumed to be original products. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has proven that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name under paragraphs 4(a)(ii) and 4(c) of the Policy.

3. The Panel is convinced that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant and its rights in the Trademarks. This finding is supported by the facts that the Respondent used the disputed domain name for an online shop that prominently featured the Complainant's stylised and coloured SUDOCREM logo and images of SUDOCREM-branded items offered at discounted prices. Regarding bad faith use, by using the disputed domain name in connection with an online store offering for sale potentially counterfeited products of the Complainant, the Respondent was, in all likelihood, trying to divert traffic intended for the Complainant's website to its own for commercial gain as set out under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **sudocrem.shop**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Peter Müller**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-03-28

Publish the Decision