Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108776

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108776
Time of filing	2026-06-30 09:15:16
Domain names	Eurexmarket.com, eurexsa7trading.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Deutsche Börse AG

Complainant representative

Organization	Grünecker Patent- und Rechtsanwälte PartG mbB

Respondent

Name	KHOM CHENTRA

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 states that it is the owner of the following international, EU and national trademark registrations:

- 812147 “EUREX” (WIPO), registered on 28 July 2003, for goods and services in classes 35, 36, 16, 38, 9, 41, 42;
- 635015 “EUREX” (WIPO), registered on 5 December 1994, for products and services in classes 35, 36, 9, 42;
- 000744763 “EUREX” (EUIPO), registered on 8 June 1999, for goods and services in classes 35, 38, 36, 16, 9, 42;
- 303090642 “EUREX” (Germany), registered on 24 April 2003, for goods and services in classes 9, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42;
- UK00900744763 “EUREX” (UK), registered on 8 June 1999, for products and services in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 38, 42;
- 5591453 “EUREX” (China), registered on 14 December 2009, for services in class 36;
- 06018304 “EUREX” (Malaysia), registered on 24 September 2008, for services in class 36;
- 0810709 “EUREX” (Mexico), registered on 28 February 2007, for services in class 42;
- 828775923 “EUREX” (Brazil), registered on 18 October 2011, for services in class 36.

The Complainant proved its ownership of the aforementioned trademark registrations by the submitted extracts from the WIPO Madrid, EUIPO, TMview databases and from the German, British and Brazil national trademark registers.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a global company established in 1992 and based in Frankfurt/Main, Germany. It is the parent company of Deutsche Börse Group, which, inter alia, consists of Eurex Frankfurt AG (100 % subsidiary) and Eurex Global Derivatives AG (100 % subsidiary).

The Complainant is one of the leading marketplace organizers for financial services, particularly trading in shares and other securities worldwide. As an international exchange organization and innovative market infrastructure provider, the business areas of the Complainant cover the entire financial market transaction process chain. This includes the provision of investment management solutions, indices (including the world-famous DAX index) and data, as well as admission, trading and clearing. Additionally, it comprises services for funds, the settlement and custody of financial instruments as well as the management of collateral and liquidity.

As a technology company, the Complainant develops IT solutions for the provision of financial services and operates IT systems all over the world. These IT solutions cover financial market solutions, commodities market solutions, network connectivity services, trading tools and the Deutsche Börse Group API Platform. In view of this, the Complainant has a far broader scope of business than all its national and international competitors do.

As of 31 December 2022, the Complainant and its subsidiaries employed approx. 11,000 staff working at 55 locations worldwide (with locations in Luxembourg, Prague, Cork, London, New York, Chicago, Hong Kong, Singapore, Peking, Tokyo and Sydney). In addition, the Complainant cooperates with other exchange organizations for increasing the efficiency of capital markets worldwide.

Among others, Deutsche Börse Group organizes one of the world's largest derivative markets under the trademark EUREX and operates one of the world's leading clearinghouses with EUREX CLEARING. In the area of securities financing, it further operates EUREX REPO.

In particular, the Complainant provides the following IT solutions under the trademark “EUREX”: Eurex Clearing's C7; Eurex Clearing's Eurex OTC Clear; Eurex Clearing's C7 SCS; Eurex Clearing Prisma.

Since its inception in 1998, EUREX has continuously set a proven track record in electronic trading and clearing and is proving the success of its business model by providing highly efficient liquidity pools. Having quickly become an integral part of the global derivatives market, EUREX has closed with record volumes of traded contracts almost every year (more than 1.8 billion contracts in 2024). Today, more than 400 market participants from 32 countries are connected to the EUREX trading system. More than 8,000 traders are admitted at EUREX.

The disputed domain names <eurexmarket.com> and <eurexsa7trading.com> (hereinafter “disputed domain names”) were registered on 19 June 2026 (<Eurexmarket.com>) and 24 June 2026 (<eurexsa7trading.com>). According to the Registrar, the Respondent is ‘KHOM CHENTRA’. The Respondent’s provided address as being in Cambodia.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain names should be transferred to it.

RESPONDENT:

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 UDRP).

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 UDRP).

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 UDRP).

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

In the present case, the Respondent has not submitted any Response and consequently has not contested any of the contentions made by the Complainant. Therefore, the Panel proceeds to decide only on the basis of the Complainant's factual statements and the documentary evidence provided in support of them [Paragraph 5(f) of The Rules].

1. CONFUSING SIMILARITY

The Panel finds that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks.

The WIPO Overview 3.1 in Paragraph 1.2.1 states: "Where the complainant holds a nationally or regionally registered trademark or service mark, this prima facie satisfies the threshold requirement of having trademark rights for purposes of standing to file a UDRP case."

The WIPO Overview 3.1 in Paragraph 1.7 states: "[…] in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark […] the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark for purposes of UDRP standing."

The WIPO Overview 3.1 in Paragraph 1.8 states: "Where 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."

The WIPO Overview 3.1 in Paragraph 1.11.1 states: "The applicable Top Level Domain ("TLD") in a domain name (e.g., ".com", ".club", ".nyc") is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test."

In the present case, the Complainant has established that it owns numerous international, EU and national trademark registrations for the "EUREX" verbal element.

In the first disputed domain name <eurexmarket.com>, the "EUREX" trademarks are clearly recognizable and used in its entirety. The addition of the general descriptive "market" term in the disputed domain name is not sufficient to avoid the finding of the confusing similarity to the Complainant's trademarks.

The same applies to the second disputed domain name <eurexsa7trading.com>. The "EUREX" trademarks are also presented and used in its entirety. It is accompanied by the general descriptive "trading" expression and the "sa7" term, which is clearly meaningless. Moreover, since some services of the Complainant are connected with the "C7" element, the use of "sa7" term might increase confusion in the minds of consumers. None of these additions is capable of preventing from the finding of the disputed domain name to be confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

The addition of the <.com> TLD in both disputed domain names is not sufficient to prevent the finding of confusing similarity since it is regarded as a necessary technical requirement of registration.

As a result, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the UDRP.

2. THE RESPONDENT´S LACK OF RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTEREST IN THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAMES

The Panel finds that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain names.

According to Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP, the Complainant shall make a case that the Respondent lacks rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. If the Complainant fulfils this demand the burden of proof shifts to the Respondent and so the Respondent shall demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. If the Respondent fails to prove its rights or legitimate interests, it is assumed that the Complainant satisfied the element of Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP (see CAC Case No. 102430, Lesaffre et Compagnie v. Tims Dozman). Moreover, past panels were of the view that it is difficult or sometimes impossible to prove negative facts, i.e., absence of rights or legitimate interest on the part of the Respondent. In this respect, past panels referred to the WIPO Case No. D2000-1769, Neusiedler Aktiengesellschaft v. Vinayak Kulkarni. Within the meaning of Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, once the complainant has made something credible (prima facie evidence), the burden of proof shifts to the Respondent to show that he has rights or legitimate interests in the domain name at issue by providing concrete evidence.

The WIPO Overview 3.1 in Paragraph 2.5.1 states: "Generally speaking, UDRP panels have found that domain names identical to a complainant's trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation."

The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not commonly known under the disputed domain names. Further, the Complainant states that the disputed domain names were only created on 19 June 2026 and 24 June 2026, and are thus younger than the Complainant's "EUREX" trademark. Therefore, the Respondent could not have acquired any rights to the disputed domain names older than the Complainant's trademark rights.

The Complainant adds that there is also no use nor any demonstrable preparations thereof concerning any use of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant states that the Respondent does not draw the line between itself and the Complainant. The Complainant submitted a screenshot of the former website under the disputed domain name <eurexmarket.com> (the website has been deactivated after the initial version of this complaint has been filed) and a screenshot of the website which is currently available under the disputed domain name <eurexsa7trading.com>.

The Complainant claims that the websites under the disputed domain names offer and promote several IT solutions relating to the financial sector, such as trading software. The services promoted on the former/current website under the disputed domain names are highly similar to the services offered by the Complainant under the "EUREX" trademarks. The Respondent, however, does not disclose its identity, let alone set itself apart from the Complainant and its services.

The Complainant concludes that due to the disputed domain names containing the Complainant's trademarks and indications to the financial market as well as to the Complainant's IT solutions promoted under names with the element "C7", Internet users are thus given the false impression that they are visiting a website operated by the Complainant, or at least one that has some kind of commercial relationship with the Complainant and its "EUREX" trademarks.

According to the Complainant, the disputed domain names are therefore used for impersonating the Complainant or at least for creating the false impression of an affiliation with the Complainant, and for exploiting the reputation of its "EUREX" trademarks to lure Internet users to respective website in order to generate traffic and to defraud those users. This can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a Respondent.

The Respondent did not file any Response to the Complaint. Thus, the Respondent failed to demonstrate rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain names.

To the satisfaction of the Panel, the Complainant made a prima facie case that there is no connection between the Complainant and the Respondent and that the Respondent does not have authorization in the disputed domain names or in the "EUREX" trademarks from the Complainant.

Above, the Panel found that the Complainant owns numerous international, EU and national trademark registrations for the "EUREX" verbal element. Moreover, past panels have declared that the "EUREX" trademarks are well-known (cf. e.g. the CAC Case No. 104124; the CAC Case No. 104536; the CAC Case No. 105809). Therefore, the Panel is of the opinion that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant, its trademark and business activities at the moment of registering the disputed domain names.

The Respondent is not clearly recognized under the disputed domain names, and its identity is hidden in the submitted Whois information for both disputed domain names.

From the submitted screenshots of the websites under both disputed domain names, it is clear that the Respondent used and is using the disputed domain names to lead Internet users to websites promoting trading software and other IT financial solutions similar to the services provided by the Complainant. Since IT financial solutions are one of the main business activities of the Complainant, of which the Respondent was and is clearly aware, it can hardly be found that the Respondent has any rights or legitimate interests to use the disputed domain names in good faith. Moreover, the websites seem to be an attempt to mislead Internet users about the origin of the websites or their connection to the Complainant.

In conclusion, the Panel is of the view that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain names.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied the requirement under Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP.

3. THE REGISTRATION AND USE OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAMES IN BAD FAITH

The Panel finds that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain names in bad faith.

The WIPO Overview 3.1 in Paragraph 3.1.4 states: "Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith […]."

In the WIPO Case No. D2020-2116, VFS Global Services Private Limited v. WhoisGuard, Inc., Quijano & Associates / Narendra Singhmanushi, the Panel stated: "The Panel also determines that the Respondent's use of the privacy protection service, WhoisGuard in the circumstances of the present case constitutes additional evidence of bad faith. Absent any explanation from the Respondent, the Panel cannot conceive of any plausible good faith use of the disputed Domain Name that could be made by the Respondent. The Respondent's conduct in registering the disputed Domain Name therefore constitutes opportunistic bad faith."

Above, the Panel found that the Complainant owns numerous international, EU and national trademark registrations for the "EUREX" term. It was already mentioned that past panels have found the "EUREX" trademarks to be well-known (cf. e.g. the CAC Case No.

104124; the CAC Case No. 104536; the CAC Case No. 105809). The Panel is of the view that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant, its trademark and business activities at the moment of registering the disputed domain names.

The Panel cannot find any indicators of the Respondent's good faith in registering or using the disputed domain names.

Firstly, the Panel found the disputed domain names to be confusingly similar (see part 1 above). This finding itself is one of the bad faith indicators.

Secondly, from the Whois information it is clear that the identification of the Respondent is hidden (privacy protected).

Thirdly, as demonstrated by the Complainant, the disputed domain names lead Internet users to the websites offering services similar to the Complainant's business activities.

The Complainant also pointed out the lack of transparency on the websites:

- there are no verifiable details regarding the identity of the operator – the only contact information provided is the e-mail address sa7@tradingsa7.com;
- the social media logos displayed on the former/current website under the disputed domain names are not active links;
- the buttons "Terms of Service", "Privacy Policy" and "Common Problem" on the bottom of the website are not active links – they are only redirecting to the landing page.

The Panel agrees with the Complainant that this lack of transparency does not make a good impression of a reliable business.

Based on the previously mentioned facts, the Panel is of the view that the Respondent did not register and is not using the disputed domain names in good faith.

Following the above-mentioned, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied the conditions pursuant to Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the UDRP.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **Eurexmarket.com**: Transferred
2. **eurexsa7trading.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Radim Charvát**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-08-08

Publish the Decision