Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108451

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108451
Time of filing	2026-03-26 09:49:39
Domain names	siemens-healthineerss.fit, siemens-healthineerss.cc, siemens-healthineers-jp.club

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Siemens Trademark GmbH & Co. KG

Respondent

Organization	MENGNA

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 various trademark registrations for “SIEMENS” and “SIEMENS Healthineers” including the following:

- International Registration No. 1357232 for SIEMENS Healthineers and device, registered October 25, 2016; and
- International Registration No. 637074 for SIEMENS, registered March 31, 1995.

The Complainant also owns and operates domain names incorporating its SIEMENS and SIEMENS Healthineers marks, including <siemens.com> and <siemens-healthineers.com>.

The disputed domain names were registered as follows:

- <siemens-healthineers-jp.club>, registered on January 22, 2026;
- <siemens-healthineerss.fit>, registered on January 26, 2026; and
- <siemens-healthineerss.cc>, registered on January 26, 2026.

At the time of filing, the disputed domain names did not resolve to active websites and instead returned error messages indicating that the domains could not be reached.

The record also includes evidence that the disputed domain names were previously used in connection with websites impersonating the Complainant’s SIEMENS Healthineers business, including by displaying the SIEMENS Healthineers mark, branding, and English-language content.

The Respondent is MENGNA of Guang Xi Long Zhou Xian Xia Dong Zhen Dong Bu Cun Jin Bang Tun 42 Hao, Chong Zuo Shi, Guang Xi 532405, China.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, Siemens Trademark GmbH & Co. KG, is part of the Siemens Group, a global technology company headquartered in Germany. The Complainant manages the Siemens Group's trademark portfolio.

The Siemens Group is active internationally in technology, industry, infrastructure, mobility, and healthcare-related goods and services. The SIEMENS mark is widely recognized globally. The SIEMENS Healthineers mark is used in connection with the Siemens Group's healthcare business, including medical technology, diagnostic equipment, and healthcare solutions.

The SIEMENS Healtheneers is also used by Siemens Healtheneers, another company of the Siemens Group, and is one of the largest manufacturers of mediac equipment worldwide with approx. 73,000 employees and a presense in over 70 countries.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

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

Language of the Proceedings

The language of the registration agreement is Chinese. Pursuant to paragraph 11(a) of the Rules, in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement, subject to the Panel's authority to determine otherwise.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requests that English be the language of the proceeding. The disputed domain names consist of Latin characters and incorporate the Complainant's SIEMENS Healthineers mark. The record also shows that the disputed domain names were used in connection with English-language websites impersonating the Complainant's SIEMENS Healthineers business, which demonstrates that the Respondent understands English well. The use of Chinese in this case would also impose a burden on the Complainant which must be deemed significant in view of the low cost of these proceedings.

The Respondent did not make any submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered the circumstances of this case including the composition of the disputed domain name which contains the words in Latin characters, as well as the silence of the Respondent in this proceeding, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English. There does not appear to be any reasons which warrant a delay and additional expense in ordering the Complainant to translate the Complaint.

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

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy requires a complainant to show that a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights.

The Complainant has provided evidence that it owns registered trademark rights in the SIEMENS and SIEMENS Healthineers marks.

In this case, the disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's SIEMENS mark and SIEMENS Healthineers marks in their entirety. The disputed domain names <siemens-healthineerss.fit> and <siemens-healthineerss.cc> add a single letter "s" to the Complainant's SIEMENS Healthineers mark. A domain name consisting of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark is generally considered confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element (see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.9).

The disputed domain name <siemens-healthineers-jp.club> adds the letters "jp", which may be understood as a geographical term for Japan and does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity (see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8).

As for the Top-Level Domains ".fit", ".cc", and ".club", it is well established that the applicable Top-Level Domain is generally disregarded for purposes of assessing identity or confusing similarity. (see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1).

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Complainant has shown that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Once the complainant establishes a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the domain name, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to show that it has rights or legitimate interests in respect to the domain name (see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1).

In the present case, the Complainant has demonstrated a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names and the Respondent has failed to assert any such rights or legitimate interests.

The Complainant has provided evidence that it has been the registered owner of the SIEMENS and SIEMENS Healthineers marks long before the date that the disputed domain names were registered and that it has not authorised the Respondent to use the Complainant's trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names.

The Respondent did not submit a Response and did not provide any explanation for its choice of the disputed domain names nor evidence to show rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name which would be sufficient to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The complainant must also show that the respondent registered and is using the domain name in bad faith (see Policy, paragraph 4(a)(iii)). Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides circumstances that may evidence bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

The Complainant's trademark was registered years before the registration of the disputed domain names. The disputed domain names incorporate the entirety of the Complainant's SIEMENS and SIEMENS Healthineers marks with only minor variations.

The evidence shows that the disputed domain names previously resolved to websites mimicking the Complainant's SIEMENS Healthineers business, including by displaying the Complainant's mark, branding, product imagery, and English-language content. Such use is a paradigmatic example of impersonation. The Respondent used the disputed domain names to create the false impression that the websites were operated by, affiliated with, or endorsed by the Complainant.

Such conduct falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. By registering confusingly similar domain names and using them for websites impersonating the Complainant, the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of those websites.

Given the particular circumstances of this case, and the distinctive nature of the Complainant's trademark, the Panel is persuaded on by the evidence that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its SIEMENS and SIEMENS Healthineers marks at the time of registering the disputed domain names and specifically targeted the Complainant.

Further, the Panel cannot conceive any plausible good faith use to which the disputed domain names may be put. The Respondent failed to submit a response and provided no evidence to rebut the Complainant's case. The Respondent also registered the disputed domain names under a fictitious name. This is also an indication of bad faith.

Accordingly, having regard to the circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that the Complainant has met its burden under 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. **siemens-healthineerss.fit**: Transferred
2. **siemens-healthineerss.cc**: Transferred
3. **siemens-healthineers-jp.club**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Jonathan Agmon**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-05-02

Publish the Decision