Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108476

Case number	**CAC-UDRP-108476**
Time of filing	**2026-03-12 10:09:24**
Domain names	**skoda.vision**

Case administrator

Name	**Olga Slanařová (Case admin)**

Complainant

Organization	**Škoda Auto a.s.**

Complainant representative

Name	**JUDr. Jiří Čermák advokát**

Respondent

Name	**Martin Hasek**

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 bases its Complaint, among others, on the following trademarks:

- European Union trademark “ŠKODA”, no. 017991862, registered on 2 August, 2022, for goods and services in classes 9, 12, 36, 37, 38, 39;
- European Union trademark “ŠKODA”, no. 017874242, registered on 19 August, 2022, for goods and services in classes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42;
- International trademark registration “SKODA”, no. 1709710, registered on 3 November 2022, for goods and services in classes 09, 12, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is the largest automobile manufacturer in the Czech Republic, boasting a history that spans more than 120 years. The company traces its origins back to Laurin & Klement, a pioneering enterprise that became part of the Škodovy závody machinery group in Pilsen in 1925.

The first automobile branded as “ŠKODA” was the Škoda 4 R, introduced to the market in 1928.

The Complainant's principal and largest manufacturing plant is located in Mladá Boleslav. It also operates two additional manufacturing facilities in the Czech Republic, situated in Kvasiny and Vrchlabí. In terms of revenue, Škoda Auto a.s. has long been the Czech Republic's largest company, its largest exporter, and one of its most significant employers.

Since 1991, Škoda Auto a.s. has been part of the German Volkswagen Group.

In addition to its strong presence in Europe, ŠKODA vehicles are exported to numerous markets worldwide, and the Complainant maintains sales agencies across Asia, Africa, South America, and Oceania.

The visual identity of the ŠKODA brand, which combines the word mark "ŠKODA" with its winged arrow logo, has evolved since its inception in 1923. The current corporate visual identity has been in use in its definitive form since 2022.

The Complainant is the owner, among others, of the ŠKODA/SKODA trademarks cited above.

Additionally, the "ŠKODA" denomination constitutes a distinctive part of the Complainant's registered business name, under which the Complainant conducts its business globally.

The disputed domain name <skoda.vision> was registered on 18 February 2025 and resolves to an active website, that focuses on SKODA cars, especially their design, displaying the Complainant's current SKODA logo, a pop-up and footer note that indicates that, the website is not yet affiliated with the Complainant, and, among others, the statement that, the website was "Made with [love] by MESH for Škoda Auto a.s.".

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.

The Complainant's contentions are the following:

The disputed domain name < skoda.vision> is identical or at least confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark ŠKODA/SKODA, that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name for a number of reasons and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

No administratively compliant Response has been filed, including after the procedural order issued by the Panel on 10 April, 2026.

The procedural order was issued by the Panel as CAC has received a request from the Respondent, who claimed that he was unable to access the platform. New access credentials were provided to the Respondent by CAC and the Panelist has decided to grant the Respondent an additional period of four (4) calendar days (ending on April 14,2026 - midnight), to allow for the submission of a Response, with the mention that, should the Respondent fail to submit a Response in English within this extended deadline, the Panel shall proceed on the basis that no Response has been filed in this proceeding, which the Respondent failed to file.

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.

On 10 April, 2026, a procedural order was issued by the Panel.

The procedural order was issued, as CAC has received a request from the Respondent, who claimed that he was unable to access the platform. New access credentials were provided to the Respondent by CAC and the Panelist has decided to grant the Respondent an additional period of four (4) calendar days (ending on April 14, 2026 - midnight), to allow for the submission of a Response, with the mention that, should the Respondent fail to submit a Response in English within this extended deadline, the Panel shall proceed on the basis that no Response has been filed in this proceeding, which the Respondent failed to file.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

1. Identity / Confusing Similarity

The Panel agrees that the disputed domain name <skoda.vision> is identical to the Complainant's trademark ŠKODA/SKODA, as it incorporates the entirety of the trademark. (WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), point 1.7).

Moreover, the extension ".vision" is not to be taken into consideration when examining the identity or confusing similarity between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name (WIPO Case No. D2010-1059, RapidShare AG, Christian Schmid v. InvisibleRegistration.com, Domain Admin). The mere adjunction of a gTLD such as ".vision" is irrelevant as it is well established that the generic Top Level Domain is insufficient to avoid a finding of identity or confusing similarity (WIPO Case No. 2013-0820, L'Oréal v Tina Smith, WIPO Case No. D2008-0820, Titoni AG v Runxin Wang and WIPO Case No. D2009-0877, Alstom v. Itete Peru S.A.).

Therefore, the Panel is satisfied that the first condition under the Policy is met.

2. Lack of Respondent's rights or legitimate interests

The Complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. Once such prima facie case is made, the burden of proof shifts to the respondent to come forward with appropriate allegations or evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. If the respondent fails to come forward with such appropriate allegations or evidence, a complainant is generally deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP.

Based on the available evidence, the Respondent does not appear to be known by the disputed domain name as such is not identified in the WHOIS database as the disputed domain name or by the term "Skoda" or "Škoda". The Complainant has never authorised the Respondent to make use of its ŠKODA/SKODA trademark, including in the disputed domain name. In addition, the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant or with any company within the Complainant's group.

Based on the available evidence, the disputed domain name resolves to an active website, that focuses on SKODA cars, especially their design, displaying the Complainant's current SKODA logo, as well as a pop-up and footer note that indicates that, the website is not yet affiliated with the Complainant, aspect which might lead to the impression for Internet users that this website might be in the future affiliated to the Complainant, and, among others, the statement that, the website was "Made with [love] by MESH for Škoda Auto a.s.", which also might lead to a misunderstanding for Internet users, as such might think that there might be potential endorsement by the Complainant, when it is not the case. In such cases, where the domain name is identical to the trademark, previous panels have noted that this prevents the trademark holder from exercising its rights to the mark and so managing its presence on the Internet, including through a corresponding email address. WIPO Overview 3.1, point 2.7.

The above does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services, or to a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes that the Respondent had an opportunity to comment on the Complaint's allegations by filing a Response, which the Respondent failed to do.

Thus, the Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has at least established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the Panel takes the view that also the second requirement under the Policy is met.

3. Bad Faith

Based on the available evidence, the Complainant's ŠKODA/SKODA trademark is highly distinctive and pre-dates the registration date of the disputed domain name. Thus, the Respondent has chosen to register the disputed domain name incorporating in its entirety the Complainant's ŠKODA/SKODA trademark in order to create confusion with such trademark. Therefore, the Panel concludes that at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant's ŠKODA/SKODA trademark and has intentionally registered one in order to create confusion with such trademark.

In the present case, the following factors should be considered:

(i) the Complainant's ŠKODA/SKODA trademark predates the registration date of the disputed domain name and enjoys a high

distinctive character;

(ii) the Respondent failed to submit any response and has not provided any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use of the disputed domain name;

(iii) the Respondent registered the disputed domain name incorporating in its entirety the Complainant's ŠKODA/SKODA trademark in order to create confusion with such trademark;

(iv) the Respondent was not authorised to use a domain name incorporating the Complainant's trademark;

(v) the disputed domain name resolves to an active website, that focuses on SKODA cars, especially their design, displaying the Complainant's current SKODA logo, without right, a pop-up and footer note that indicates that, the website is not yet affiliated with the Complainant, aspect which might lead to the impression for Internet users that this website might be in the future affiliated to the Complainant, and, among others, the statement that, the website was "Made with [love] by MESH for Škoda Auto a.s.", which also might lead to a misunderstanding for Internet users, as such might think that there might be potential endorsement, affiliation, authorization by the Complainant, when it is not the case.

In light of the foregoing, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has registered and has been using the disputed domain name in bad faith. Thus, also the third and last condition under the Policy is satisfied.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **skoda.vision**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Delia-Mihaela Belciu**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-04-19

Publish the Decision