

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108822

Case number CAC-UDRP-108822

Time of filing 2026-07-08 10:38:53

Domain names lindtsprunglisweet.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization Chocoladefabriken Lindt & Sprüngli AG

Complainant representative

Organization SILKA AB

Respondent

Organization dantangchun

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

Trademark	Jurisdiction	Registration Number	Registration Date	Class(es) Covered
LINDT & SPRÜNGLI	United Kingdom	UK00905677224	6 Feb 2008	30, 35, 43
LINDT & SPRÜNGLI	European Union	005677224	6 Feb 2008	30, 35, 43
LINDT & SPRÜNGLI	Canada	TMA705725	25 Jan 2008	30
LINDT	Germany	91037	27 Sep 1906	30
LINDT	United States	87306	9 Jul 1912	30

LINDT [device]	United Kingdom	UK00000551197	17 May 1934	30
LINDT [device]	International	576529	10 Sep 1991	30
LINDT	International	622189	12 Jul 1994	30
LINDT	European Union	000134007	7 Sep 1998	30
LINDT [device]	International	1277242	7 Oct 2015	29, 30, 32

The reputation of the Complainant and its products have been recognized in multiple prior UDRP proceedings. In this regard, several panels have expressly acknowledged the distinctive and well-known nature of the LINDT mark, including in [CAC-UDRP-108637](#) (“the reputation of the trademark LINDT (in the chocolate sector), which is fully and identically incorporated in the disputed domain name”), [CAC-UDRP-108640](#) (“the LINDT Trademark is certainly well-known, based on its long and widespread use and numerous registrations worldwide”), [CAC-UDRP-107468](#) (“considering the well-known character of the Complainant’s trademark LINDT, the Respondent was or should have been aware of the Complainant and its trademark rights when it registered the disputed domain names”) or [CAC-UDRP-107492](#) (“the Complainant’s trademark is well known. The reputation of the trademark LINDT makes it very improbable that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant’s exclusive rights on LINDT at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name”).

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a company headquartered in Switzerland that has been active in the chocolate and confectionery industry since 1845. Over the course of its long history, it has established itself as one of the world’s leading premium chocolate manufacturers. Its global operations are supported by 12 production facilities, a network of more than 600 branded stores, and over 100 independent distribution partners across numerous markets worldwide. The Complainant employs in excess of 15,000 people and reported revenues of CHF 5.92 billion and operating profits of CHF 971 million in 2025. The Complainant’s products are marketed in more than 120 countries and encompass approximately 2,500 product lines sold under a number of well-known brands, including LINDT, GHIRARDELLI or RUSSELL STOVER.

The Complainant’s international commercial activities have been accompanied by the acquisition of extensive trademark protection for the term LINDT worldwide. This protection encompasses not only numerous registrations for the standalone LINDT mark, but also registrations for trademarks incorporating LINDT & SPRÜNGLI (a substantial portion of its company name, Chocoladefabriken Lindt & Sprüngli AG) in various jurisdictions.

Leading brand valuation rankings continue to place LINDT among the most valuable food brands worldwide. Notably, Brand Finance listed LINDT among the Top 100 Food Brands in 2025, ranking the brand in tenth position globally and estimating its value at approximately USD 4.9 billion.

Complainant maintains a substantial online presence. Among other digital assets, the Complainant operates the domain name <lindt.com>, originally registered on December 16, 1997, and in use since 1998. This domain directs Internet users to country-specific versions of the Complainant’s website according to their geographic location. These local websites generally provide information regarding the Complainant and its activities in the relevant market and, in many cases, offer the possibility of purchasing the Complainant’s products through integrated online stores.

Complainant’s visibility on the Internet extends well beyond its official websites. It has established a significant presence across major social media platforms, with its official Facebook page attracting close to seven million followers, its Instagram account followed by more than 200,000 users, and its LinkedIn profile boasting approximately 159,000 followers

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

The Complainant, among other things, contends the following in support of the complaint.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademarks LINDT and LINDT SPRÜNGLI and its associated domain names.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and he is not related in any way to the Complainant. The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with, the Respondent.

Given the distinctiveness and well-known status of the Complainant's trademark and reputation, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent has registered the domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark. Furthermore, the disputed domain name is inactive. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has not demonstrated any activity in respect of the disputed domain name, and it is 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, phishing, or an infringement of the Complainant's rights under trademark law.

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).

This is a case of adding a descriptive term "sweet", after the Complainant's trademark LINDT SPRÜNGLI, it is found that the disputed domain name <lindtsprunglisweet.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark LINDT SPRÜNGLI.

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).

Given the circumstances of the case, among others well-known character of Complainant's trademark LINDT and LINDT SPÜNGLI, it is inconceivable to the Panel in the current circumstances that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without prior knowledge of the Complainant and the Complainant's marks and domain names.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

The incorporation of a well-known mark into a domain name, coupled with an inactive website, may in itself be evidence of bad faith registration and use.

It is not possible for the Panel 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, a phishing purpose based on the related MX-records, or an infringement of the Complainant's rights under trademark law.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 three essential issues under the paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are whether:

- i. the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- ii. the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name; and
- iii. the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

2. The Panel reviewed carefully all documents provided by the Complainant. The Respondent did not provide the Panel with any documents or statements. The Panel also visited all available websites and public information concerning the disputed domain name, namely the WHOIS databases.

3. The UDRP Rules clearly say in their Article 3 that any person or entity may initiate an administrative proceeding by submitting a complaint in accordance with the Policy and these Rules.

4. The Panel therefore came to the following conclusions:

a) The Complainant states and proves that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark and its domain names. Indeed, the disputed domain name is merely adding the descriptive term "sweet" behind the Complainant's trademark.

The disputed domain name is therefore deemed confusingly similar.

b) The Respondent is not generally known by the disputed domain name and has not acquired any trademark or service mark rights in the name or mark, nor is there any authorization for the Respondent by the Complainant to use or register the disputed domain name. The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent does not have rights or a legitimate interest with respect to the disputed domain name.

c) It is clear that the Complainant's trademarks and website(s) were used by the Complainant long time before the disputed domain name was registered.

The Panel finds it inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's trademark and domain names at the time of registering the disputed domain name and therefore finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

The incorporation of a well-known mark into a domain name, coupled with an inactive website, may in itself be evidence of bad faith registration and use.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

For the reasons stated above, it is the decision of this Panel that the Complainant has satisfied all three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

- 1. **lindtsprunglisweet.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Lars Karnoe
------	-------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION	2026-08-07
------------------------	------------

Publish the Decision
