# Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108582

| | |
|---|---|
| Case number | CAC-UDRP-108582 |
| Time of filing | 2026-04-15 10:02:19 |
| Domain names | boehringer-inegelheim.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 | elchen darpa |

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings which are pending or decided and relate to the disputed domain name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant has adduced evidence showing it is the owner of the following trademarks for the brand and corporate name BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM:

1. International trademark No. 221544 for a figurative mark, registered on 2 July 1959 in Nice Classification List classes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 16, 17, 19, 29, 30 and 32;

2. International trademark No. 568844 for a figurative mark, registered on 22 March 1991 in Nice Classification List classes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 16, 30 and 31.

Both international trademarks' basic registration was in Germany. The countries designated for their applicability varied between the two, but the trademarks assure extensive international protection. The Complainant claims that it has more trademarks, but did not provide evidence of them.

The Complainant submitted WHOIS evidence showing that it has been the registrant of the domain name <boehringer-ingelheim.com> since 1 September 1995. The Complainant claims that it is the registrant of further domain names, but again, without providing evidence.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name <boehringer-inegelheim.com> on 12 April 2026 according to the Registrar Verification obtained by the CAC Case Administrator.

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a German pharmaceutical company that dates back to 1885 and is a world leader in the human and veterinary health sectors, driven by a strong R&D profile. Information submitted by the Complainant states that it has over 50,000 employees, is active in more than 130 markets and had net sales in 2024 approaching €27 billion.

The Complainant adduced screenshot evidence to show that the disputed domain name resolves to a page under construction, entitled "Coming Soon!", and to demonstrate that e-mail (MX) traffic to the disputed domain name is redirected to another provider's server than the one hosting the name.

For its part, the Panel during its routine scrutiny of the Case File ascertained that a credible (mobile) telephone number was given at registration of the disputed domain name by the Respondent when providing contact details. However, the first and last names given raise suspicion, the address is incomplete and appears to be defective and the user name in the e-mail address given appears to be constructed with reference to a popular video game rather than containing any identifying information. The Panel also reviewed the MX redirection evidence submitted by the Complainant and, in exercise of its powers under the Rules, determined upon brief investigation online that the server address to which e-mails are redirected (a FDQN) is one commonly reported to be associated with malware and phishing.

## PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

1. The domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name <boehringer-inegelheim.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks for BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM and to its domain name <boehringer-ingelheim.com>. The obvious misspelling of the Complainant’s trademark BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM by addition of the letter “E” in the disputed domain name's stem is characteristic of typosquatting, whose purpose is to create confusion among internet users. The Complainant also contends that the addition of the gTLD extension <.com> does not change the overall impression that gives rise to confusing similarity.

2. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name

The Respondent contends that the Respondent is not identified in the WHOIS database as the disputed domain name and that the Respondent has no right or legitimate interest with respect to the disputed domain name <boehringer-inegelheim.com>, given its confusing similarity to the Complainant's protected brand. The Respondent is not related in any way to the Complainant and has been granted no licence or authorization to make any use of the Complainant’s trademark BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM, including as regards registration of the disputed domain name. Instead, the disputed domain name is a typosquatted version of the trademark BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM: that is, it follows the illegitimate practice of registering a domain name in an attempt to take advantage of internet users’ typographical errors. Furthermore, the disputed domain name resolves to a page under construction and thus the Complainant contends that the Respondent did not make any use of the disputed domain name since its registration, which confirms that the Respondent has no demonstrable plan to use the disputed domain name and so, again, demonstrates a lack of legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name.

3. The domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith

Given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark and its reputation, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark, given, again, the disputed domain name's confusing similarity to the Complainant's trademarks. The misspelling of the trademark BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM was hence intentional in designing the disputed domain name in this way, a circumstance which previous UDRP Panels have found to be evidence of bad faith. Moreover, the disputed domain name resolves to a page under construction, thus showing that the Respondent has not demonstrated any activity in respect of the disputed domain name. It is also not possible to conceive of any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the domain name by the Respondent that would not be illegitimate, such as by being a passing off, an infringement of consumer protection legislation, or an infringement of the Complainant’s rights under trademark law. Finally, MX servers are configured which suggests that the disputed domain name may be actively used for e-mail purposes.

RESPONDENT:

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

## RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to trademarks 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 that 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 the UDRP were met and that there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

The Panel notes that its résumé of the Parties' contentions includes for the Complainant only its arguments pertinent to reaching a decision in this proceeding; it omits in particular references made to past ADR Panels' Decisions. The Panel declines to consider a contention based on decisions of some previous Panels regarding prima facie proof as to the second part of the UDRP cumulative test (i.e. relating to the Complainant's responsibility to show a Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in respect of a disputed domain name) since this contention is irrelevant to the circumstances of this proceeding.

## PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

This is a clear case of the domain name abuse known as typosquatting. Applying the UDRP cumulative three-part test to its substance, the Panel finds in particular as follows:

1. Establishment of the Complainant's rights and the identicality or confusing similarity of the disputed domain name in their regard

The evidence submitted by the Complainant substantiates its protected rights in the corporate name and brand BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM, which is a distinctive appellation, while the disputed domain name <boehringer-inegelheim.com> cannot reasonably be construed other than as a deliberate approximation to that appellation and to its particular form in the Complainant's own domain name <boehringer-ingelheim.com>. Indeed, the design of the disputed domain name with its mere addition of the letter "e" positioned in the second alphabetic part of the name's stem appears calculated to exploit the tendency of the human brain to prioritize cognition (meaning) over distinguishing the precise visually correct form of words, particularly where those words -- as with a domain name -- serve a function (see as to psychological research in this regard Case CAC-UDRP-106831). In other words, several internet users when confronted with the disputed domain name, and especially on smaller devices, may not spot the added letter; and, without that letter, the disputed domain name would of course be identical to the Complainant's domain name including its hyphen and <.com> extension. There can thus be no doubt that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's protected brand, especially to the Complainant's rendition of it in its domain name.

The Panel thus FINDS that the first criterion of the UDRP's test is fulfilled in this proceeding.

2. Absence of rights or a legitimate interest on the Respondent's behalf in the disputed domain name

The Panel accepts that the Respondent cannot be known by the disputed domain name and that there is no relationship between the Parties or any form of authorization granted to the Respondent by the Complainant which could found a right or legitimate interest on the Respondent's behalf. Nor does the Case File reveal any ulterior purpose or use that might otherwise furnish the Respondent with a right or legitimate interest. Rather, this is a self-evident case of typosquatting, as noted at the outset. The Panel does not, however, find the last of the arguments put forward by the Complainant under this part of the UDRP test to have any foundation in this case's circumstances. Contrary to what the Complainant claims -- that there is no demonstrable plan on the Respondent's behalf to use the disputed domain name -- the evidence submitted by the Complainant to support this contention (a screenshot of a hosting server's construction page to which the disputed domain name resolves) appears to announce that content will be "coming soon", which is hardly objectionable in itself considering that the disputed domain name was registered only two days before the Complainant introduced its claim at the CAC. Further, the Complainant contradicts itself by submitting, and then relying upon (as to the third part of the UDRP test, bad faith), other evidence showing clear preparation (at least) for use of the disputed domain name, i.e. the screenshot it submitted of redirection of e-mails to a third-party provider's e-mail server. Beyond the Complainant's contentions, the Case File plainly shows (see Factual Background) signs of suspicious contact details being given by the Respondent at registration of the disputed domain name, which militate against any residual possibility of there being a right or legitimate interest on the Respondent's behalf in this case.

The Panel therefore FINDS that the second criterion of the UDRP's test is satisfied in this proceeding.

3. Bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name

The Panel accepts the Complainant's contention that, when devising the disputed domain name's design, the Respondent must have known about the Complainant and have realized that its registration of a domain name so designed would be sure to impinge on the Complainant's rights. This inference as to registration, which indicates bad faith, can also be combined with another, which is that the Complainant did not perform such a registration idly; it had a plan of some sort. Insight into the nature of that plan arises from the Complainant's screenshot of the redirection put in place by the Respondent to a third-party e-mail provider, which a routine check shows to be associated with reports of facilitating malware and phishing, and from self-evidently suspicious contact details given by the Respondent when registering the disputed domain name. Given the Complainant's business areas and that the Respondent has equipped itself with a means to impersonate the Complainant, one can thus imagine that the Respondent seeks to achieve some form of illegitimate gain thereby. That gain, most probably ultimately financial in nature, can only, in turn, be at the expense of the Complainant's rights and reputation and at the expense of internet users who may be deceived. Therefore, and notwithstanding one of the Complainant's own contentions as to non-use of the disputed domain name, the circumstances before the Panel show ample grounds indicating bad faith use of the disputed domain name following its bad faith registration.

The Panel hence FINDS that the third and final criterion of the UDRP's test has been met and thus ORDERS transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **boehringer-inegelheim.com**: Transferred

## PANELLISTS

| Name | **Kevin Madders** |
|---|---|

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-05-24

Publish the Decision