Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108537

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108537
Time of filing	2026-03-31 08:54:35
Domain names	eurex-verify.com, eurex-verify.org

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Deutsche Börse AG

Complainant representative

Organization	Grünecker Patent und Rechtsanwälte PartG mbB

Respondents

Name	Nina Brown
Name	Carl Pots

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 names.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations for the sign EUREX, including in particular:

- International Registration No. 635015 “EUREX”, registered on 1 December 1994, covering goods and services in Classes 9, 35, 36 and 42;
- International Registration No. 812147 “Eurex”, registered on 28 July 2003, covering goods and services in Classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 38, 41 and 42;
- European Union Trade Mark No. 000744763 “EUREX”, registered on 8 June 1999, covering goods and services in Classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 38, 41 and 42;
- European Union Trade Mark No. 003378973 “Eurex US”, registered on 21 March 2005, covering goods and services in Classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 38, 41 and 42;

as well as further registrations in multiple jurisdictions.

These trademarks cover, inter alia, financial services, stock exchange services, data processing, telecommunications, and related activities.

The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has established rights in the EUREX trademark for the purposes of the UDRP.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is Deutsche Börse AG, a well-known operator of financial markets and related services.

The disputed domain name <eurex-verify.com> was registered on 25 February 2026.

According to the Registrar's verification, the registrant of the disputed domain name is identified as Nina Brown, with an address indicated as "An der Hauptwache 5, Frankfurt am Main, 60313", while the country is listed as "GB".

The Panel notes that this information appears internally inconsistent, as the address provided corresponds to a location in Germany, whereas the country field indicates the United Kingdom.

According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the disputed domain name has been used in connection with a phishing scheme. In particular, an email address associated with the disputed domain name was used to impersonate the Complainant and to request payments from third parties. This conduct was also the subject of an abuse report addressed to the hosting provider.

There is no evidence on the record of any active legitimate website associated with the disputed domain name.

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 names are 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 names (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 names have been registered and are 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 have been met and that there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

Consolidation of Multiple Respondents

The Complainant has requested consolidation of the proceedings in respect of the domain names <eurex-verify.com> and <eurex-verify.org>. Following the Registrar's verification and the notification of deficiency by the CAC, the Complainant submitted a brief request for consolidation, relying on the similarity of the domain names, their registration within a short period of time, the use of the same registrar, and certain similarities in the contact details.

Pursuant to paragraphs 3(c) and 10(e) of the Rules, consolidation may be appropriate where the complainant demonstrates that the disputed domain names are subject to common control and that consolidation would be fair and procedurally efficient.

As reflected in section 4.11.2 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions (WIPO Overview 3.1), panels typically require a prima facie showing of common control based on the available evidence, taking into account a range of factors such as similarities in registrant information, technical configuration, naming patterns, and use of the domain names.

The burden of establishing common control rests with the Complainant.

The Panel has reviewed the evidence submitted with the Complaint, as well as the registrant information disclosed by the Registrar.

(a) Similarity of the domain names

The Panel notes that the disputed domain names incorporate the identical second-level string “eurex-verify” and differ only in their respective Top-Level Domains (“.com” and “.org”).

While this similarity is acknowledged, such variations are common and, in themselves, do not establish common control.

(b) Registrant data

The Registrar’s verification shows that the disputed domain names are registered to different individuals with distinct contact details, including different names, email addresses, and telephone numbers.

While one of the records contains an apparent inconsistency regarding the country indicated, this affects only one domain name and does not establish any connection between the two registrants.

(c) Technical configuration and infrastructure

The Panel has also considered the available technical data relating to the configuration of the disputed domain names.

The record indicates that the domain names are configured through different technical setups, including differences in hosting environment and nameserver configuration (i.e., DNS setup). The Panel further notes that the email routing (MX) configurations are not identical and do not indicate that the domain names are operated through the same email service or system.

While both domain names make use of widely available third-party service providers, the use of such services is not, in itself, indicative of common control. Rather, what would be relevant is evidence of a shared or coordinated configuration, which is not apparent on the present record.

(d) Evidence of use

The evidence submitted by the Complainant indicates that the domain name <eurex-verify.com> has been used to send emails impersonating the Complainant and requesting payments, as further reflected in an abuse report submitted to the hosting provider.

However, no comparable evidence has been submitted in relation to <eurex-verify.org>, and there is nothing in the record to indicate that this domain name has been used in a similar manner or in coordination with the other domain name.

(e) Overall assessment

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain names were registered approximately one month apart. While this reflects a certain temporal proximity, such a timeframe is not, in itself, indicative of common control, particularly in cases involving domain names targeting the same trademark, where similar registrations may occur independently.

The Complainant relies primarily on the similarity of the domain names, their temporal proximity, and the use of the same registrar. The Panel considers that these elements, taken alone, are insufficient to establish common control, particularly in the absence of supporting evidence linking the registrants or demonstrating a coordinated technical setup.

On the contrary, the available evidence indicates:

- different registrant identities and contact details;
- no apparent technical linkage in the configuration of the domain names; and
- evidence of abusive use relating only to one of the domain names.

In these circumstances, the Panel is not satisfied that the disputed domain names are subject to common control.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has failed to demonstrate that the requirements for consolidation are met, and the request for consolidation is denied.

As a consequence, the Panel will proceed to decide the present dispute on the merits only with respect to the domain name <eurex-verify.com>.

The proceedings in relation to the domain name <eurex-verify.org> are terminated without prejudice to the Complainant’s right to file a separate complaint concerning that domain name.

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove each of the following three elements to succeed in the administrative proceeding:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; 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 by the Respondent in bad faith.

I. THE COMPLAINANT'S RIGHTS AND THE CONFUSING SIMILARITY OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME TO THE COMPLAINANT'S MARK

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established rights in the EUREX trademark.

The disputed domain name <eurex-verify.com> incorporates the Complainant's EUREX trademark in its entirety, with the addition of the term "verify" and a hyphen.

The addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. On the contrary, the term "verify" may increase the likelihood of confusion, as it suggests a connection with authentication or security processes commonly associated with online services.

The Top-Level Domain ".com" is disregarded for the purpose of the comparison.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

II. THE RESPONDENT'S LACK OF RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS IN RESPECT OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME

The Complainant has made a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has not submitted any response and has not provided any evidence of rights or legitimate interests.

There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Moreover, the evidence on record indicates that the disputed domain name has been used to send emails impersonating the Complainant and requesting payments from third parties.

Such use cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

III. THE REGISTRATION AND THE USE OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME IN BAD FAITH

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Given the distinctiveness of the EUREX trademark and its use in the financial sector, the Panel considers it unlikely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its rights.

This conclusion is reinforced by the composition of the disputed domain name, which combines the EUREX trademark with the term "verify", a term that suggests authentication or security processes and is apt to mislead users into believing that the domain name is associated with the Complainant.

Furthermore, the evidence shows that the disputed domain name has been used to send emails impersonating the Complainant and requesting payments from third parties.

Such conduct constitutes a clear example of phishing and supports a finding of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, as it demonstrates an intent to create a likelihood of confusion with the EUREX trademark for the purpose of obtaining financial gain.

The Panel also notes that the contact details provided by the Respondent appear internally inconsistent, which further supports an inference of bad faith.

In light of the above, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Partially Accepted/Partially Rejected

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

1. **eurex-verify.com**: Transferred
2. **eurex-verify.org**: Terminated (consolidation not granted)

PANELLISTS

Name	**Ivett Paulovics**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-04-27

Publish the Decision