Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108595

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108595
Time of filing	2026-04-22 08:59:15
Domain names	neurex.ink

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Deutsche Börse AG

Complainant representative

Organization	Grünecker Patent und Rechtsanwälte PartG mbB

Respondent

Name	qi queen

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

The Complainant invokes various trademarks including the following:

- International trademark EUREX No. 635015 registered on December 5, 1994, covering goods and services in classes 19, 35, 36 and 42;
- European Union trade mark EUREX No. 000744763 registered on June 8, 1999, covering goods and services in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 38 and 42;
- Chinese trademark EUREX No. 5591453 registered on December 14, 2009 in class 36.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, Deutsche Börse AG, is a market place organizer for financial services, particularly trading in shares and other securities worldwide. The Complainant is also a transaction service provider, which affords international companies and investors access to global capital markets by means of advanced technology. Its´ product and service portfolio covers the entire process chain from order input to custody of shares and derivatives. The Complainant's group has customers in Europe, the USA and Asia, who are serviced by more than 10.000 employees at locations in Germany, Luxembourg, Switzerland and the USA, as well as at representative offices in London, Paris, Chicago, New York, Hong Kong, Dubai, Moscow, Beijing, Tokyo and Singapore. Among others, the Complainant's group organizes a derivatives market, including for cryptocurrencies, under the trademark EUREX and

operates a clearing house under the name EUREX CLEARING. In the area of securities financing it further operates under the name EUREX REPO.

The Complainant is the owner of various registered trademarks including an international mark EUREX in various classes since 1994. The Complainant also operates the domain name <eurex.com>.

The disputed domain name <neurex.ink> was registered on March 16, 2026. The disputed domain name currently does not resolve to an active website, but according to the Complainant's evidence, it previously resolved to a website that appeared to offer credit and trading services.

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 name is 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 name (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 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

Paragraph 15 of the Rules provides that the Panel is to decide the complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

The onus is on the Complainant to make out its case and it is apparent, both from the terms of the Policy and the decisions of past UDRP panels, that the Complainant must show that all three elements set out in Paragraph 4 (a) of the Policy have been established before any order can be made to transfer a domain name. As the proceedings are administrative, the standard of proof is the balance of probabilities.

Thus, for the Complainant to succeed it must prove, within the meaning of Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy and on the balance of probabilities that:

1. The domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
2. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and
3. The domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel has therefore dealt with each of these requirements in turn.

1. Identity of confusing similarity

The Complainant must first establish that there is a trademark or service mark in which it has rights. Since the Complainant shows to be the holder of registered EUREX trademarks, which are used in connection with the Complainant's financial services, it is established that there is a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

The disputed domain name <neurex.ink> includes the Complainant's mark in its entirety, with the sole addition of the letter "n". The Panel finds that this addition does not prevent the disputed domain name from being confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark as the latter remains recognizable within the disputed domain name (see section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview 3.1).

It is well established that the Top-Level Domains such as ".ink" may be disregarded when considering whether the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights (see section 1.11 WIPO Overview 3.1).

For these reasons, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. Accordingly, the Complainant has made out the first of the three elements that it must establish.

2. No rights or legitimate interests

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, the Complainant has the burden of establishing that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

It is established case law that it is sufficient for the Complainant to make a prima facie showing that the Respondent has no right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name in order to shift the burden of proof to the Respondent (see section 2.1 WIPO Overview 3.1 and Champion Innovations, Ltd. V. Udo Dussling (45FHH), WIPO case No. D2005-1094; Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd., WIPO case No. D2003-0455; Belupo d.d. v. WACHEM d.o.o., WIPO case No. 2004-0110).

The Panel notes that the Respondent does not seem to be commonly known by the disputed domain name and that the Respondent has not acquired trademark or service mark rights. According to the information provided by the Registrar, the Respondent is known as "qi queen". The Respondent's use and registration of the disputed domain name was not authorized by the Complainant. There are no indications that a connection between the Complainant and the Respondent existed.

Beyond looking at the domain name and the nature of any additional terms appended to it, UDRP panels assess whether the overall facts and circumstances of the case, such as the corresponding website content and the absence of a response, support a fair use or not (see sections 2.5.2 and 2.5.3 of the WIPO Overview 3.1).

According to undated but undisputed evidence provided by the Complainant, the disputed domain name resolved to a website which appeared to offer credit and trading services similar to the Complainant's financial services. The Panel finds that this does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services, or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name currently does not appear to resolve to an active web page anymore. In the Panel's view, this does not amount to any legitimate noncommercial or fair use or use in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services either.

The Respondent had the opportunity to demonstrate its rights or legitimate interests but did not do so. In the absence of a Response from the Respondent, the prima facie case established by the Complainant has not been rebutted.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In light of the above, the Complainant succeeds on the second element of the Policy.

3. Bad faith

The Complainant must prove on the balance of probabilities that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith and that it is being used in bad faith (see section 4.2 WIPO Overview 3.1 and e.g. Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallow, WIPO Case No. D2000-0003; Control Techniques Limited v. Lektronix Ltd, WIPO Case No. D2006-1052).

According to the Panel, the awareness of a respondent of the complainant and/or the complainant's trademark rights at the time of registration can evidence bad faith (see Red Bull GmbH v. Credit du Léman SA, Jean-Denis Deletraz, WIPO Case No. D2011-2209; Nintendo of America Inc v. Marco Beijen, Beijen Consulting, Pokemon Fan Clubs Org., and Pokemon Fans Unite, WIPO Case No. D2001-1070).

In the instant case, the Panel finds that the Respondent must have had knowledge of the Complainant's rights in the EUREX trademark at the moment it registered the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's EUREX trademark with the sole addition of one letter and, according to the Complainant's evidence, the website linked to the disputed domain name appeared to offer services similar to the Complainant's services. The Complainant invokes trademarks

which predates the disputed domain name by decades. Moreover, the reputation of the Complainant's EUREX trademark has been confirmed by previous UDRP panels (see Deutsche Börse AG v. Sergio Netz, CAC Case No. 106424; Deutsche Börse AG v. xu ying (ke ji chuang xin), Patrick Troy (Tivia Media), jung nam kim, CAC Case No. 106040).

In the Panel's view, the fact that the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding (see section 3.3 WIPO Overview 3.1).

Finally, the Respondent did not formally take part in the administrative proceedings. According to the Panel, this serves as an additional indication of the Respondent's bad faith.

Therefore, the Panel finds that, on the balance of probabilities, it is sufficiently shown that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In light of the above, the Complainant also succeeds on the third and last element of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **neurex.ink**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Flip Petillion**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-05-27

Publish the Decision