

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108738

Case number CAC-UDRP-108738

Time of filing 2026-06-17 09:45:08

Domain names nexgardbrasil.site

Case administrator

Name Olga Dvořáková (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM ANIMAL HEALTH FRANCE

Complainant representative

Organization NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name daniel alves alves

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 owns several trade marks consisting of or incorporating the name NEXGARD, including the international trade mark NEXGARD, registration number 1166496, first registered on 29 May 2013 in international class 5; the European Union trade mark NEXGARD, registration number 011855061, first registered on 9 October 2013 in international class 5; and the international trade mark NEXGARD, registration number 1676177, first registered on 19 May 2022 in international class 5. The aforementioned trade mark registrations of the Complainant all predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is part of the family-owned Boehringer Ingelheim group of companies, and is active in the pet and equine markets, where it provides vaccines, parasiticides and therapeutics. NEXGARD is a drug delivered in a beef-flavoured chew that kills adult fleas and is indicated for the treatment and prevention of flea infestations and the treatment and control of tick infestations in dogs and puppies.

The disputed domain name <nexgardbrasil.site> was registered on 31 March 2026 and resolves to an error page without active content. There is no evidence before the Panel to suggest that the disputed domain name has ever been used for an active website since it was registered.

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 trade mark 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

With regard to the first UDRP element, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name <nexgardbrasil.site> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trade mark NEXGARD. Indeed, the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trade mark in its entirety but adds the geographical term "brasil" ("Meaning "Brazil" in Portuguese) as suffix to the Complainant's trade mark. The Panel follows in this respect the view established by numerous other decisions that a domain name which wholly incorporates a Complainant's registered trade mark may be sufficient to establish confusing similarity for the purposes of the UDRP (see, for example, WIPO Case No. D2003-0888, Dr. Ing. h.c. F. Porsche AG v. Vasilij Terkin <porsche-autoparts.com>). The Panel further considers it to be well established that the addition of a descriptive or geographical term does not allow a domain name to avoid confusing similarity with a trade mark (see, for example, WIPO Case No. D2019-2294, Qantas Airways Limited v. Quality Ads <qantaslink.com>; and CAC Case No. 102137, Novartis AG v. Black Roses <novartiscorp.com>). Other panels have previously found that "[W]here the relevant trademark is recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element" (see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.8; and, for example, WIPO Case No. D2023-2542, Merryvale Limited v. tao tao <wwwbetway.com>; and WIPO Case No. D2020-0528, Philip Morris Products S.A. v. Rich Ardtea <global-iqos.com>). Against this background, the Panel finds that the addition of the geographical term "brasil" to the Complainant's trade mark is not sufficient to alter the overall impression of the designation as being connected with the Complainant's trade mark and does not prevent a likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant and its trade mark. To the contrary, the disputed domain name rather adds to the likelihood of confusion because the addition of the geographical term "brasil", in conjunction with the Complainant's trade mark NEXGARD, suggests that the disputed domain name links to an official website of the Complainant for the Brazilian market, and implies that it is linked to the Complainant and its business.

With regard to the second UDRP element, there is no evidence before the Panel to suggest that the Respondent has made any use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Neither is there any indication that the Respondent is making legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Indeed, the disputed domain name is not being used for any active website but resolves to an error page. A lack of content at the disputed domain has in itself been regarded by other panels as supporting a finding that the Respondent lacked a bona fide offering of goods or services and did not make legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name (see, for example, Forum Case No. FA 1773444, Ashley Furniture Industries, Inc v. Joannet Macket/JM Consultants). The Panel further finds that the

Respondent is not affiliated with or related to the Complainant in any way and is neither licensed nor otherwise authorised to make any use of the Complainant’s trade marks, or to apply for or use the disputed domain name. Additionally, the Whois information for the disputed domain name does not suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name <nexgardbrasil.site. Past panels have held that a respondent was not commonly known by a disputed domain name if the Whois information was not similar to the disputed domain name, as is equally not the case here (see, for example, Forum Case No. FA 1781783, Skechers U.S.A., Inc. and Skechers U.S.A., Inc. II v. Chad Moston / Elite Media Group <bobsfromsketchers.com> (“Here, the WHOIS information of record identifies Respondent as “Chad Moston / Elite Media Group.” The Panel therefore finds under Policy ¶ 4(c)(ii) that Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name under Policy ¶ 4(c)(ii).”). Against this background, and absent any response from the Respondent, or any other information indicating the contrary, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

With regard to the third UDRP element, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent either knew, or should have known, that the disputed domain name would be confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trade mark, and that he registered the disputed domain name in full knowledge of the Complainant’s trade mark. If the Respondent had carried out a Google search for the term “Nexgard”, the search results would have yielded immediate results related to the Complainant and its connected product. Indeed, it is likely that the disputed domain would not have been registered if it were not for the Complainant’s trade mark (see, for example, WIPO Case No D2004-0673 Ferrari Spa -v- American Entertainment Group Inc <ferrariowner.com>). Furthermore, the disputed domain name is inactive. The Respondent has not demonstrated any activity in respect of the disputed domain name. First, it is difficult to conceive of any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent that would not be illegitimate on the grounds that it would constitute passing off, an infringement of consumer protection legislation, or an infringement of the Complainant’s rights under trade mark law under circumstances where the disputed domain name corresponds to the Complainant’s trade mark. Secondly, numerous other UDRP decisions have taken the view, which this Panel shares, that the passive holding of a domain name with knowledge that the domain name infringes another party’s trade mark rights may in itself be regarded as evidence of bad faith registration and use (see, for example, WIPO Case No. D2000-0003, Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows; and WIPO Case No. D2004-0615, Comerica Inc. v. Horoshiy, Inc.). Absent any response from the Respondent, or any other information indicating the contrary, the Panel therefore also accepts that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

- 1. nexgardbrasil.site: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Gregor Kleinknecht LLM MCI Arb
------	--------------------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-07-22

Publish the Decision