Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108683

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108683
Time of filing	2026-05-26 11:26:37
Domain names	blglogisitics.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	BLG LOGISTICS GROUP AG & Co. KG

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Organization	mk cars

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 is the owner of multiple trademark registrations incorporating BLG LOGISTICS, including, inter alia:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 8073002 for the mark BLG LOGISTICS (fig.), registered on December 23, 2025 in classes 35, 36, 37, and 39;

- International Trademark Registration No. 1860476 for the mark BLG LOGISTICS (fig.), registered on February 6, 2025 in classes 35, 36, 37, and 39;

- European Union Trademark Registration No. 019064627 for the mark BLG LOGISTICS (fig.), registered on December 27, 2024 in classes 35, 36, 37, and 39.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a Germany seaport and logistics service provider with an international network.

Since the Complainant was founded in 1877, the Complainant is now represented with almost 100 locations and branches in Europe, America, Africa and Asia. The Complainant has also operated domain name <blg-logistics.com> since 2004.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 6, 2026. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to the parking page, which includes the statement “Launching Soon”, as well as a “Contact Us” section featuring a form with fields for name, email, and message.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant

The Complainant asserts that each of the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy and the corresponding provisions in the Rules have been satisfied. In particular, the Complainant asserts that:

(1) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark, since it incorporates the BLG LOGISTICS mark and the addition of the letter “I” in the generic term “Logistics” does not prevent confusion. The gTLD “.com” does not prevent the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant and its trademark;

(2) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, has no license or authorization to use the BLG LOGISTICS mark, and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant also claims that typosquatting is occurring, and finds this is additional evidence that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests under Policy. The disputed domain name resolves to the landing page. The Complainant contends that the Respondent did not make any use of the disputed domain name since the registration, and it confirms that the Respondent has no demonstrable plan to use them. Such conduct negates any claim of legitimate interests;

(3) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Registering the disputed domain name so obviously connected to a well-known mark without authorization is itself evidence of bad faith. Since the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant’s BLG LOGISTICS mark with the addition of the letter “I”, there is reason to believe that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark. The disputed domain name is a landing page, which does not preclude a finding of bad faith.

The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions.

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

To succeed in a UDRP complaint, a complainant must demonstrate that all the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, as follows:

1) that the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the complainant has rights;

2) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

3) that the disputed domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

The Respondent had 20 days to submit a response in accordance with paragraph 5(a) of the Rules and failed to do so. Paragraph 5(f) of the Rules establishes that if a respondent does not respond to the Complaint, the Panel's decision shall be based upon the Complaint. The Complainant bears the burden of proving that all these requirements are fulfilled, even if the Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's contentions.

The Panel has taken note of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, Edition 3.1 ("WIPO Overview 3.1") and, where appropriate, will decide consistent with the consensus views captured therein.

Identical or Confusingly Similar

According to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, it should be established that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a mark in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant has demonstrated ownership of its BLG LOGISTICS trademark in various jurisdictions. The Panel is therefore satisfied that the Complainant has valid registered trademark rights. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

With the Complainant's trademark rights established, the remaining question under the first element of the Policy is whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark. As clarified in WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7, this element primarily serves as a standing requirement, and the test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's mark and the disputed domain name, focusing on whether the Complainant's mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's BLG LOGISTICS trademark, as it directly and entirely incorporates the Complainant's mark with the addition of the letter "l". The disputed domain name contains an evident misspelling of the Complainant's trademark, which constitutes a typical case of typosquatting. Such a minor misspelling does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, as the Complainant's BLG LOGISTICS mark remains clearly recognizable and constitutes the dominant element of the disputed domain name. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.9; ELO v. Albert Poussin, WIPO Case No. D2025-4924.

In line with established UDRP practice, the generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is disregarded when assessing confusing similarity. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.

The Panel therefore concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights, and the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is satisfied.

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.

While the overall burden of proof remains with the Complainant, UDRP panels have consistently recognized that requiring a complainant to prove a negative would often be impracticable, as the relevant evidence concerning a respondent's rights or legitimate interests is typically within the respondent's knowledge. Accordingly, once the Complainant establishes a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to demonstrate such rights or legitimate interests under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

In the present case, the Complainant asserts that it has not authorized the Respondent to use its BLG LOGISTICS trademark in any manner. The Panel further notes that the Complainant has established trademark rights in BLG LOGISTICS and has confirmed that it has no relationship with the Respondent. The Respondent has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the Complainant's trademark. There is also no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

The disputed domain name resolves to the parked page, which includes the statements "Launching Soon", and "Contact Us" section featuring a form with fields for name, email, and message. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of the Policy. The evidence shows that the disputed domain name is not used for any genuine business purpose. Such usage of the disputed domain name and non-operational content does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy and WIPO Overview 3.1 sections 2.2. There is no evidence that, before notice of the dispute, the Respondent made any demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a legitimate offering of goods or services. Nor does the Respondent's conduct qualify as a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name under paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. In the absence of any legitimate use, the Respondent has failed to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Complainant has established a strong prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has failed to rebut this case or to provide any evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

Registered and Used in Bad Faith

According to paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove on the balance of probabilities both that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant's BLG LOGISTICS trademark registrations predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The evidence shows that the Complainant's trademarks were registered and had already gained substantial recognition well before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in 2026. The Complainant's marks are distinctive and well known in the seaport and logistics service sector, where the Complainant enjoys worldwide recognition.

The Respondent's incorporation of the Complainant's BLG LOGISTICS trademark in its entirety, combined with the addition of the letter "l" and the gTLD ".com", reinforces an impression of association with the Complainant. This strongly indicates that the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant and its reputation at the time of registration. Given the distinctiveness of the mark and the Complainant's extensive public presence, it is inconceivable that the Respondent independently selected the disputed domain name without prior knowledge of the Complainant.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying a "Launching Soon" message and including a "Contact Us" section through which visitors may enter and submit their contact details. Therefore, by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial purposes, internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of its website.

The Respondent's conduct also demonstrates deliberate concealment. The website contained no imprint or identifying information, and the Whois record lists only the Registrar's contact details rather than those of the actual registrant. This intentional anonymity, coupled with the imitation of the Complainant's website, clearly indicates an attempt to mislead Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name is operated by, or affiliated with the Complainant.

On the balance of the evidence, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name was motivated by the notoriety and goodwill of the Complainant's BLG LOGISTICS trademark. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to host a deceptive, imitation website constitutes a classic example of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, as it reflects a deliberate effort to exploit the Complainant's mark to attract users under false pretenses.

Taken together, these circumstances demonstrate a deliberate and sustained effort by the Respondent to exploit the Complainant's reputation and to mislead consumers for commercial gain.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name was both registered and used in bad faith within the meaning of 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. **blglogisitics.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Ganna Prokhorova**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-06-20

Publish the Decision