Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108702

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108702
Time of filing	2026-06-04 09:47:05
Domain names	boehringer-animalhealth.com, boehringer-healthcare.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Boehringer Ingelheim Pharma GmbH & Co.KG

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	tohka yatogami

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 names.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant owns the international trademark registration no. 799761, “BOEHRINGER” (word), which was registered on December 2, 2002, and has been renewed since then. It is registered for various goods and services in Nice classes 1, 3, 5, 10, 16, 30, 31, 35, 41, 42, and 44.

The disputed domain names were both registered on May 28, 2026, i.e., the Complainant’s trademark registration cited above predates the registration of the disputed domain names.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

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

Ever since, BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM has become an international pharmaceutical enterprise with around 54,300 employees. It is divided into two business areas: Human Pharma and Animal Health. In 2025, BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM achieved global net sales of EUR 27.8 billion.

Both disputed domain names resolve to a parking page with commercial links, i.e., a website displaying paid advertisements.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain names 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 names are 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 names (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 names have been registered and are 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

The disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s distinctive trademark “BOEHRINGER”. The addition of the generic terms “-animalhealth” and “-healthcare” does not change the overall impression that the respective designation is connected to the Complainant’s trademark “BOEHRINGER”. In fact, the association of the added terms with the trademark increases the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain names and the Complainant’s trademark, because the added terms refer directly to the two business sectors in which the Complainant operates.

The Panel further finds that the Complainant successfully submitted prima facie evidence that the Respondent has neither made any use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor is making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain names, nor is commonly known under the disputed domain names. Using the disputed domain names for a parking page website with commercial advertising links to third-party products may be considered a “use” of the disputed domain names in connection with an “offering of goods or services” – but the parking page website is evidently not a bona fide offering (see below on the corresponding aspects of bad faith). The Complainant’s prima facie evidence was not challenged by Respondent.

The Panel further finds that the Complainant successfully submitted prima facie evidence that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith, namely by intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, internet users to the Respondent’s advertising pages by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the products advertised there, paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademarks and its reputation, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain names with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark. Again, the Complainant’s prima facie evidence was not challenged by Respondent.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **boehringer-animalhealth.com**: Transferred
2. **boehringer-healthcare.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Dr. Thomas Schafft**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-07-15

Publish the Decision