Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108332

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108332
Time of filing	2026-02-24 10:06:01
Domain names	karhushoes.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Karhu Holding B.V.

Complainant representative

Organization	Coöperatie SNB-REACT U.A.

Respondent

Name	Domain Admin

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 many trademarks for KARHU, e.g. European Union trademark registration no. 006954903 KARHU (word), registered on 15/07/2010 for goods in classes 18, 25 and 28; US national trademark registration No. 907891 for KARHU, registered on February 16, 1971, for goods and services of classes 10, 16, 18, 20, 22, 25 and 28.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

It results from the Complainant's undisputed allegations that it was founded in 1916 in Helsinki and originally produced skis, spikes, and track equipment and became known for outfitting Olympic athletes. Over the last decades, it introduced innovations such as air cushioning and Fulcrum technology in running shoes, solidifying its reputation for performance and comfort. Today, it offers premium running shoes, lifestyle sneakers, and sports apparel and operates internationally, with a strong presence in Europe, North America, and Japan.

Furthermore, the Complainant uses the domain name < karhu.com >, registered on April 12, 1999, for its official website.

The disputed domain name < karhushoes.com > was registered on November 7, 2025. The undisputed evidence provided by the Complainant proves that it resolved to a parking page displaying Pay-Per-Click ("PPC") links and the indication "The domain karhushoes.com may be for sale. Click here to inquire about this domain."

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

1. Pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the complainant must establish rights in a trademark or service mark, and that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the complainant has rights.

It results from the evidence provided, that the Complainant is the registered owner of KARHU trademarks.

Prior UDRP panels have found that a disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a complainant's trademark where the disputed domain name incorporates the complainant's trademark in its entirety (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.0") at section 1.7. This Panel shares this view and notes that the Complainant's registered trademark KARHU is fully included in the disputed domain name.

Although the addition of other terms (here "shoes") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.8.

Finally, the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" of the disputed domain name is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test (see WIPO Overview 3.0 at section 1.11.1).

In the light of the above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

2. Pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, the Complainant must secondly establish that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy contains a non-exhaustive list of circumstances which, if found by the Panel to be proved, shall demonstrate the Respondent's rights or legitimate interests to the disputed domain name.

In the Panel's view, based on the undisputed allegations stated above, the Complainant has made a prima facie case that none of these circumstances are found in the case at hand and, therefore, that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the

disputed domain name.

According to the Complaint, which has remained unchallenged, the Complainant has no relationship in any way with the Respondent and did, in particular, not authorize the Respondent's use of the Complainant's trademark KARHU, e.g. by registering the disputed domain name, comprising said trademark entirely plus a generic term referring to the Complainant's business. Furthermore, the Panel notes that there is no evidence showing that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain name in the sense of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

Furthermore, it results from the undisputed evidence before the Panel that the disputed domain name < karhushoes.com > has resolved to a parking website comprising PPC links that compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant's trademark or otherwise mislead Internet users. Prior UDRP panels have found that the use of a domain name to host a parked page comprising PPC links does not represent bona fide offering of goods or services, where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant's mark or otherwise mislead Internet users (see WIPO Overview 3.0 at section 2.9, with further references). This Panel shares this view.

It is acknowledged that once the Panel finds a prima facie case is made by a complainant, the burden of production under the second element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name (see WIPO Overview 3.0 at section 2.1). Since the Respondent in the case at hand failed to come forward with any allegations or evidence, this Panel finds, in the circumstances of this case, that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has therefore satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

3. According to paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the Complainant must thirdly establish that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Policy indicates that certain circumstances specified in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy may, "in particular but without limitation", be evidence of the disputed domain name's registration and use in bad faith.

One of these circumstances is that the Respondent by using the disputed domain name, has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainants' mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or location or of a product or service on its website or location (paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy).

In the present case, the Panel notes that it results from the Complainant's documented allegations that the disputed domain name resolved to a parking page displaying PPC links that compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant's trademark or otherwise mislead Internet users. For the Panel, it is therefore most likely that the Respondent positively knew the Complainant's mark, which predates by many years the registration of the disputed domain name, incorporating Complainant's mark KARHU entirely plus a generic term "shoes" referring to the Complainant's business. Consequently, and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the Panel is convinced that the Respondent targeted the Complainant's trademark when it registered the disputed domain name.

Finally, the further circumstances surrounding the disputed domain name's registration and use confirm the findings that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith (see WIPO Overview 3.0 at section 3.2.1):

(i) the nature of the disputed domain name (i.e., entirely containing the Complainant's registered trademark KARHU - which has existed since 1971 - followed by a descriptive term which clearly refers to the Complainant's field of commerce);

(ii) the content of the website to which the disputed domain name directs (i.e. a parking page displaying PPC links that compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant's trademark or otherwise mislead Internet users and displaying the indication that the disputed domain name may be for sale);

(iii) a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no credible explanation for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name;

(iv) the respondent's concealing its identity through a privacy service.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has therefore satisfied paragraph 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. **karhushoes.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Dr. Federica Togo

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-04-01

Publish the Decision