Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108566

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108566
Time of filing	2026-04-10 09:43:54
Domain names	boehringerbiopharma.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Boehringer Ingelheim Pharma GmbH & Co.KG

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Leeson Ki

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

According to the evidence submitted by Complainant, Complainant is the owner of international trademark BOEHRINGER nr. 799761, registered since 2 December 2002.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

According to the information provided by the registrar the disputed domain name <boehringerbiopharma.com> was registered on 7 April 2026.

According to the information provided by Complainant the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page with commercial links. At the time of the decision the disputed domain name resolves to a website mentioning “is parked free, courtesy of GoDaddy.com”, containing the text “Get this Domain” and an article written by “Staff Writer” about “Tech Trends: Bio-Digital Twins to Green Software”.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

Complainant

Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it.

According to the evidence submitted by Complainant, Complainant is a German family-owned pharmaceutical group of companies with roots going back to 1885, when it was founded by Albert Boehringer (1861-1939) in Ingelheim am Rhein.

Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark BOEHRINGER as the disputed domain name incorporates the entirety of the trademark. According to Complainant the addition of the term “biopharma” is not sufficient to escape the finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark BOEHRINGER. It does not change the overall impression of the designation as being connected to Complainant’s trademark. On the contrary, the addition of the term “biopharma” to the trademark BOEHRINGER reinforces the risk of confusion as it refers to Complainant’s activities.

According to Complainant, Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name. Respondent is not related in any way with the business of Complainant. Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with Respondent. Neither license nor authorization has been granted to Respondent to make any use of Complainant’s trademark. According to Complainant the disputed domain name points to a parking page with commercial links. Past panels have found it is not a bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

According to Complainant the disputed domain name is registered and is being used in bad faith. Given the distinctiveness of Complainant's trademark and its reputation, it is reasonable to infer that Respondent has registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of Complainant's trademark. Furthermore, the disputed domain name points to a parking page with commercial links. Complainant contends the Respondent has attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain to his own website thanks to Complainant’s trademarks for its own commercial gain, which is an evidence of bad faith.

Respondent

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

RIGHTS

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 Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown 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

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

In the opinion of the Panel the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark. Many UDRP decisions have found that a disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a complainant’s trademark where the disputed domain name contains the entirety of a trademark. Complainant has established that it is the owner of a trademark registration for BOEHRINGER. The disputed domain name incorporates the entirety of the well-known BOEHRINGER trademark as its distinctive element. The addition of the word “biopharma” in the disputed domain name, is insufficient to avoid a finding of confusing similarity as the BOEHRINGER trademark remains the dominant component of the disputed domain name. The Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”)

“.com” in the disputed domain name may be disregarded.
The Panel notes that Complainant’s registration of its trademark predates the creation date of the disputed domain name.

In the opinion of the Panel Complainant has made a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Complainant has not licensed or otherwise permitted Respondent to use its trademark or to register the disputed domain name incorporating its mark. Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark of Complainant. Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name nor has it acquired trademark rights. Complainant has no relationship with Respondent. The Panel notes the undisputed submission of Complainant that the disputed domain name resolves or resolved to a parking page with commercial links and the fact that at the time of the decision the disputed domain name resolves a website mentioning “is parked free, courtesy of GoDaddy.com”, containing the text “Get this Domain” and an article written by “Staff Writer” about “Tech Trends: Bio-Digital Twins to Green Software”.
Respondent did not submit any response.
Under these circumstances, the Panel finds that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. Complainant has rights in the BOEHRINGER trademark. Respondent knew or should have known that the disputed domain name included Complainant’s well-known mark.
The Panel notes that the disputed domain name incorporates Complainant’s well-known trademark in its entirety, which indicates, in the circumstances of this case, that Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name with the intention to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the trademark of Complainant as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or location or of a service on its website or location, which constitutes registration and use in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **boehringerbiopharma.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Dinant T.L. Oosterbaan**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-05-12

Publish the Decision