# Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108587

| | |
|---|---|
| Case number | CAC-UDRP-108587 |
| Time of filing | 2026-04-20 08:06:33 |
| Domain names | babbel-for-english.com, babbel-for-eng.com, english-with-babbel.com, babbel-english.com |

## Case administrator

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

## Complainant

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization | Babbel GmbH |

## Complainant representative

| | |
|---|---|
| Organization | Lubberger Lehment Rechtsanwälte Partnerschaft mbB |

## Respondents

| | |
|---|---|
| Name | Adi Wils |
| Name | Dieter Lorentz |

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is unaware of any other pending or decided legal proceedings relating to the disputed domain names.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant owns various trademarks worldwide, inter alia:

- German trademark “babbel” (figurative), DPMA no. 307705668, registered March 13, 2008;
- International Registration no. 1248282 for “BABBEL” (word), based on the Spanish trademark no. 3546896, registered March 12, 2015;
- International Registration no. 1239167 for „+Babbel“ (fig.), based on the EU trademark no. 013646179, registered February 5, 2015;
- EU trademark no. 013641485 for “BABBEL” (word) filed 14 January 2015;
- EU trademark no. 017887213 for “Babbel” (word) filed 12 April 2018;
- EU trademark no. 013646179 for „+Babbel“ (fig.) filed 15 January 2015.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, Babbel GmbH (the “Complainant”) offers online language learning services and operates one of the world’s most

popular language learning apps. The Complainant was founded in 2007 and has rapidly grown since then. Today it is one of the highest-selling language learning platforms globally and employs roughly 490 people worldwide. Enclosed as Annex 1 is a Wikipedia article on Babbel.

The Complainant was one of the first language learning platforms to introduce a language learning app. Nowadays, the Babbel e-learning platform offers various resources for language tuition such as a self-study app (Babbel), in-app games, a language-learning browser extension, podcasts and sophisticated language learning services for companies and employees (Babbel for Business). The curriculum includes over 10,000 lessons in 14 languages (Spanish, French, German, Italian, Portuguese, Polish, Russian, Dutch, Turkish, Danish, Norwegian, Swedish, Indonesian, English).

The Complainant is operating the website www.babbel.com. The Complainant's domain <babbel.com> was registered in 2000. On www.babbel.com the Complainant advertises and offers its aforementioned language-learning services in different languages, inter alia in English and French. On its further website www.babbelforbusiness.com the Complainant offers its language learning services for business clients. To protect its business activities, the Complainant holds several additional domain names.

Since the release of the Complainant's apps for mobile devices, it has been among the most popular apps in the education sector. In 2013 the Complainant's Babbel apps were downloaded over 10 million times and have been ranked number one in the educational app store download charts in more than 35 countries across four continents. In 2025 the Complainant had already sold over 25 million paying subscriptions for its app worldwide.

In line with the high level of market presence, the Complainant and its services have been the subject of continuous press coverage for many years. The reporting about the Complainant and its services covers a wide range of topics: Besides reports about the economic success of the company and a planned initial public offering (IPO), reports also covered the goods and services offered by the Complainant in connection with the war in Ukraine. The Complainant has put together a compilation of press articles and reports published worldwide about its goods and services since 2013. Several thousand publications have been registered in print and online journals, magazines and newspapers, radio and TV stations with a high reach and visibility.

The Complainant recently became aware of the disputed domain names, namely <babbel-english.com>, <babbel-for-english.com>, <babbel-for-eng.com> and <english-with-babbel.com>. The disputed domain names were registered only recently in October and November 2025.

The disputed domains currently resolve to online casino and gambling websites by automatic redirects under the following URLs:

<babbel-english.com> to https://neon-54.click/;

<babbel-for-english.com> to https://35bet-thailand.top/;

<babbel-for-eng.com> to https://888starz-pt.top/;

<english-with-babbel.com> to https://neospin-au.top/neospin-casino-mobile/.

On these websites, casino and betting services are promoted, including the possibility to register accounts and access promotional offers.

A review of archived webpages ("Wayback Machine") shows that the disputed domain names were used in January 2026 to host websites offering a purported language learning platform under the sign "Babbel". These websites promoted language courses, live classes, and AI-driven speech tools, and invited users to create accounts, thereby creating the impression of an official Babbel service.

---

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

1. Preliminary matters

The Complainant requests the consolidation of the disputed domain names in a single proceeding pursuant to Rule 3(c) of the UDRP Rules.

The disputed domain names are subject to common control, as evidenced by the following factors. First, three of the four domain names <babbel-for-english.com>, <babbel-for-eng.com>, and <english-with-babbel.com> — are registered with the same registrar,

Gname.com Pte. Ltd. The disputed domain name <babbel-english.com> is registered with 101domain GRS Ltd. The fact that the disputed domain name <babbel-english.com> is allegedly associated with a different registrant does not exclude the possibility of a consolidation of the disputed domain names in a single proceeding. Second, all disputed domain names were registered within a short period of time: <babbel-english.com> on 15 October 2025, <babbel-for-english.com> and <babbel-for-eng.com> on 29 October 2025, and <english-with-babbel.com> on 28 November 2025. Third, all disputed domain names use the same nameservers.

In addition, the disputed domain names follow a consistent naming pattern incorporating the Complainant's trademark “Babbel” combined with descriptive terms such as “English” or “eng”. This systematic structure further indicates that the domain names form part of a coordinated scheme.

Further indicative of common control, the disputed domain names resolve, and have resolved, to websites displaying substantially identical content, in some cases merely translated into different languages. The websites share, and have shared, the same structure, layout, and commercial purpose, namely, to attract internet users by reference to the Complainant's trademarks.

2. The disputed domain names are confusingly similar to Complainant’s trademarks

The disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks “Babbel”. The public recognises that the domain names consist of two elements: the trademark and therefore highly distinctive element “babbel” and the additional elements “english”, “eng” and the prepositions “for” or “with”. The distinctive element “babbel” is identical to the Complainant’s trademark “Babbel”. The additional elements “english”, “for-english”, “for-eng” and “english-with” are merely of descriptive character. The disputed domain names are dominated by the distinctive trademark “Babbel”. It is well established that where a mark forms the distinctive part of a disputed domain name and is supplemented only by descriptive elements, the domain name is considered confusingly similar to the registered mark. There is high similarity in phonetic and visual terms between the trademark and the disputed domain names and accordingly, the domain names are confusingly similar to the trademark.

The TLD “.com” has to be ignored for the purpose of assessing identity or similarity, as the TLD only has a technical function

3. Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names

The Respondent has no rights in respect of the disputed domain names. The Respondent has not been commonly known by the domain names. The Respondent has not acquired a trademark for the sign “Babbel”. In particular, the Complainant has no relationship with the Respondent and has not authorized the Respondent to use the sign “Babbel”, neither on its website nor in a domain name. The disputed domains have been registered only recently in 2025.

Moreover, the Respondent has no legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain names. The disputed domain names were used in January 2026 for a language learning platform which directly competes with the services offered by the Complainant under the sign “Babbel”. Today, the domain names resolve to online casino and gambling websites. It must be assumed that this is done with the intention of misleading consumers who are looking for the Complainant’s highly recognized services under the Babbel brand. By doing so, the Respondent obtains an economic advantage using the Complainant’s trademark, thereby benefiting from the recognition and reputation of the Babbel trademarks without providing any financial compensation.

4. The disputed domains registered and used in bad faith

First, the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain names isss intended to disrupt the Complainant’s business. By adopting the Complainant’s sign “Babbel”, the Respondent exploits the Complainant’s reputation and tries to divert customers from the Complainant’s official platform Babbel. The Respondent is aware that inattentive internet users who encounter one of its websites are likely to assume that they have reached a site operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant. The Respondent provides neither a legal notice nor any disclaimer to dispel this impression. Taking advantage of the Complainant’s trademark and reputation in this manner, without permission or justification, constitutes registration in bad faith and the manner of use following registration is use in bad faith. The overall effect of this conduct is to deprive the Complainant of revenue.

Secondly, the Respondent’s actions also constitute bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The high similarity between the disputed domain names and the Complainant’s trademark and domain shows that the Respondent seeks to mislead Internet users for commercial gain. These circumstances constitute bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Finally, there is no plausible good faith use of the domain name by the Respondent. The term “Babbel” is not a generic term and has no dictionary meaning. The domain <babbel.com> was first registered by the Complainant in 2000, and the trademark was in use for many years before the disputed domain name was registered. From the perspective of the relevant public, the sign “Babbel” is exclusively associated with the Complainant. This follows from the wide-spread use and recognition of the mark and is further supported by the results of a Google search for the term “Babbel”. When conducting such a search, all search results lead to or refer to the Complainant. The Complainant is omnipresent on the Internet, also under its domain name <babbel.com>, and there is no possibility that the Respondent could have been unaware of the Complainant when registering the disputed domains in 2025.

RESPONDENT

No administratively compliant Response was filed.

## RIGHTS

To the satisfaction of the Panel, the Complainant has shown that the disputed domain names, as described below, are identical or confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

## NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

To the satisfaction of the Panel, the Complainant has shown the Respondent to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names, as described below (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

## BAD FAITH

To the satisfaction of the Panel, the Complainant has shown the disputed domain names, as described below, have been registered and are being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

## PROCEDURAL FACTORS

Before proceeding to the dispute's substance, the Panel must address the matter of the request for consolidation by the Complainant.

On the issue of consolidation, the Panel finds guidance in paragraph 4.11.2 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, which provides that where a complaint is brought against multiple respondents, panels assess whether "((i) the domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control, and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties. Procedural efficiency would also underpin panel consideration of such a consolidation scenario."

The Panel notes that the Complainant has requested consolidation of the disputed domain names pursuant to paragraph 3(c) of the Rules and has advanced several factors in support of its request.

Having reviewed the record at hand, the Panel finds that the circumstances presented, without any explanation to the contrary, support a finding of common control. First, three of the disputed domain names, namely: <babbel-for-english.com>, <babbel-for-eng.com>, and <english-with-babbel.com> are all registered through the same Registrar, namely Gname.com Pte. Ltd., while the disputed domain name <babbel-english.com> is registered with a different Registrar, namely 101domain GRS Ltd. The mere fact that one disputed domain name is associated with a different Registrar or nominal registrant does not, in itself, preclude consolidation where the overall record otherwise points to common control. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.11.2.

Second, the Panel, as presented in the evidence on record, notes the close temporal proximity of the registrations. The disputed domain name <babbel-english.com> was registered on October 15, 2025, <babbel-for-english.com> and <babbel-for-eng.com> on October 29, 2025, and <english-with-babbel.com> on November 28, 2025. Panels have consistently regarded coordinated registration activity within a compressed timeframe as a relevant indicator supporting common control.

Third, the disputed domain names also appear to share the same nameservers, which further supports the inference that the registrations form part of a single coordinated operation.

The Panel further observes that all disputed domain names follow a seemingly similar naming pattern incorporating the Complainant's "BABBEL" trademark together with descriptive terms such as "English" or the abbreviation "eng". Such systematic composition, without an explanation to the contrary, reflects a deliberate and coordinated targeting of the Complainant and constitutes an additional factor supporting common control.

Moreover, the disputed domain names resolve, or have resolved, to websites displaying substantially identical content, in some instances differing only by language. The websites appear to share the same overall structure, layout, and commercial purpose, namely, to attract Internet users by creating an association with the Complainant and its trademark. Prior UDRP panels have found that materially identical website content and presentation strongly support a finding of common control.

In light of the above circumstances, taken cumulatively, the Panel is satisfied that the disputed domain names are subject to common control and that consolidation of the Respondents in a single proceeding would be fair and equitable to all Parties and procedurally efficient.

Accordingly, the Panel grants the Complainant's request for consolidation. For purposes of this Decision, the term "Respondent" shall therefore refer collectively to the registrants of the disputed domain names.

The Panel further finds that the Complaint satisfies the formal requirements of the UDRP, the Rules, and the applicable Supplemental Rules.

The Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements have been met and sees no reason why it would be inappropriate to render a decision in this proceeding.

---

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

### 1. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Complainant must establish, on the balance of probabilities, that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights.

Based on the evidence presented to the Panel, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established rights in the trademark "BABBEL" through its trademark registrations and longstanding use in connection with language-learning services.

The disputed domain names <babbel-english.com>, <babbel-for-english.com>, <babbel-for-eng.com>, and <english-with-babbel.com> each incorporate the Complainant's "BABBEL" trademark in its entirety. As consistently recognized by prior UDRP panels, where a disputed domain name wholly incorporates a complainant's trademark, such incorporation is normally sufficient to establish confusing similarity for purposes of the Policy. See section 1.7 of the WIPO Overview 3.1.

The Panel further notes that the additional terms "english", "eng", "for", and "with" are descriptive or otherwise non-distinctive elements which do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. To the contrary, in the circumstances of this case, such terms reinforce an association with the Complainant's business, given that the Complainant is widely known for language-learning services, including English-language instruction. Panels have consistently found that the addition of descriptive or dictionary terms to a complainant's mark does not avoid confusing similarity under the first element. See section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview 3.1.

In addition, the Panel considers that the inclusion of these descriptive terms further supports a finding of confusing similarity in the circumstances of this case. Specifically, the terms "english", "eng", "for", and "with" appear directly related to the Complainant's business model and services in the field of language learning and, therefore, may enhance the impression of an association with the Complainant. On the balance of probabilities, and in the absence of any arguments presenting a viable and logical explanation to the contrary, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain names appears calculated to reinforce an association with the Complainant and its trademark. Nevertheless, the Panel notes that these circumstances are more appropriately examined in greater detail under the remaining elements of the Policy below.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's "BABBEL" trademark within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

### 2. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Based on the evidence presented to the Panel, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case.

The Panel notes that there is no evidence in the record indicating that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain names within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. Nor is there any indication that the Respondent owns any trademark rights corresponding to the term "Babbel". Furthermore, the Complainant states that it has neither authorized nor licensed the Respondent to use the "BABBEL" trademark in any manner, whether in a domain name or otherwise.

The Panel further observes that the disputed domain names were registered in 2025, many years after the Complainant had established rights in the "BABBEL" trademark and after the Complainant had extensively used the trademark in connection with its online language-learning platform, as per the evidence on record.

The evidence before the Panel further indicates that the disputed domain names were used to resolve to websites promoting language-learning services competing with those of the Complainant. According to the record, the websites displayed substantially similar layouts and commercial content directed to Internet users seeking language-learning services. On the balance of probabilities, and based on the evidence presented to the Panel, without any arguments presenting a viable and logical explanation to the contrary, the Panel finds that such use was intended to capitalize on the reputation and goodwill associated with the Complainant's trademark in order to attract Internet users for commercial gain.

Moreover, given the distinctive nature of the "BABBEL" trademark and the manner in which the disputed domain names combine that trademark with terms directly related to the Complainant's field of business, the Panel finds, on the balance of probabilities, that the disputed domain names were deliberately selected to create an impression of association with the Complainant. Such conduct cannot confer rights or legitimate interests upon the Respondent.

The Respondent has failed to submit any Response or otherwise provide evidence capable of rebutting the Complainant's prima facie case.

Accordingly, and in the absence of any evidence or arguments presenting a viable and logical explanation to the contrary, the Panel

finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

**3. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

Under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the Complainant must establish, on the balance of probabilities, that the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

Having considered the evidence, and in line with section 3.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, the Panel finds that the circumstances of this case support a finding of bad faith registration and use.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain names were registered in 2025, long after the Complainant had established rights and a strong reputation in the "BABBEL" trademark, as per the record at hand. Given the distinctive nature of the mark and its recognition in the field of language learning, and in the absence of any plausible explanation to the contrary, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and intentionally targeted its trademark at the time of registration.

The composition of the disputed domain names, each incorporating the "BABBEL" mark together with descriptive terms relating to language learning, further supports a finding of targeting. See section 3.2.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain names have been used to resolve to websites offering competing language-learning services and, at other times, to unrelated gambling content, seemingly to attempt to create a separation from the Complainant. On the balance of probabilities, such conduct indicates an intentional attempt to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating confusion with the Complainant's mark, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

In the absence of any Response or evidence to the contrary, the Panel finds no credible good faith explanation for the Respondent's conduct.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

**4. Decision**

For the preceding reasons and in concurrence with the provisions specified under Paragraph 4(i) of the Policy and Paragraph 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders the transfer of the disputed domain names, as per below, to the Complainant.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **babbel-for-english.com**: Transferred
2. **babbel-for-eng.com**: Transferred
3. **english-with-babbel.com**: Transferred
4. **babbel-english.com**: Transferred

## PANELLISTS

| | |
|---|---|
| Name | **Rodolfo Rivas Rea** |

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-05-22

Publish the Decision