

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108921

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108921
Time of filing	2026-08-14 10:09:29
Domain names	leerdammers.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Dvořáková (Case admin)
------	-----------------------------

Complainant

Organization	ROYAL LEERDAMMER LEERDAMMER B.V.
--------------	----------------------------------

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.
--------------	-------------------

Respondent

Organization	leerdammers OPC PVT LTD
--------------	-------------------------

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 several trademarks consisting of the word element “LEERDAMMER”, such as:
International Trademark Registration for “LEERDAMMER” No. 465749 of December 17, 1981 in class 29 (Fromage), designating AT, CH, DE, ES, FR and IT;
International Trademark Registration for “LEERDAMMER” No. 552114 of March 28, 1990 in class 29 (Fromage), designating AT, CH, CZ, DE, ES, FR, HU, IT and SK;
International Trademark Registration for “LEERDAMMER” No. 920722 of February 27, 2007 in class 29 (Cheeses and specialty cheese products), designating numerous countries including the US;
International Trademark Registration for “LEERDAMMER” No. 1725975 of January 5, 2023 in classes 9, 35, 41 and 42, designating EM and CN.

All of the above trademarks were registered prior to the registration of the disputed domain name.
Furthermore, the Complainant operates, inter alia, the domain name <leerdammer.com>, registered on April 24, 1996.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

FACTS ASSERTED BY THE COMPLAINANT AND NOT CONTESTED BY THE RESPONDENT:

The Complainant is part of a multi-national company engaged in the food industry, particularly the dairy sector. The Complainant is

the producer of LEERDAMMER, one of Europe’s most iconic cheese brands since 1974. LEERDAMMER is a cheese renowned for its uniqueness, born from the meeting of two Dutch dairymen.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademarks for LEERDAMMER registered worldwide, including international trademark registrations dating back to 1981. LEERDAMMER is also commonly used to designate the company name of the Complainant.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 29, 2026 through the registrar GoDaddy.com, LLC. According to the WHOIS database, the registrant details were privacy-protected by Domains By Proxy, LLC. The Respondent’s name was subsequently disclosed as “leerdammers OPC PVT LTD” with an address in Karur, Tamil Nadu, India.

The Complainant asserts that no company is registered under the name “leerdammers OPC PVT LTD” and that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with this name to claim an unjustified legitimate interest.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website under construction.

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 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

As the Respondent did not file an administratively compliant Response, pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), the Panel may draw such inferences therefrom as it considers appropriate. Thus, the Panel accepts the contentions of the Complainant as admitted by the Respondent. Taking the statements and documents submitted by the Complainant under careful consideration, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has established all the elements entitling it to claim the transfer of the disputed domain name.

I. Identical or Confusingly Similar disputed domain name

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name to be 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.

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown that it has valid trademark rights in “LEERDAMMER”. The Complainant holds several international trademark registrations for LEERDAMMER, the earliest dating back to December 17, 1981 (No. 465749), all of which substantially predate the registration of the disputed domain name on July 29, 2026.

The disputed domain name is a misspelling of the Complainant's LEERDAMMER trademark. The disputed domain name adds the letter "s" at the end of "leerdammer", resulting in "leerdammers". This constitutes a clear case of typosquatting, i.e. the practice of registering a domain name containing an obvious misspelling of a trademark in an attempt to take advantage of Internet users' typographical errors.

It is well established in UDRP practice that slight spelling variations do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Furthermore, it is equally well established that the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") suffix ".com" is a standard registration requirement and does not serve to distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant's LEERDAMMER trademark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name despite the addition of the letter "s".

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's LEERDAMMER trademark, and the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is satisfied.

II. Respondent's Rights or Legitimate Interests in the disputed domain name

The Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant must show, at least prima facie, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name; once such prima facie case is made, the burden of production shifts to the Respondent.

The Complainant has not licensed or otherwise consented to the Respondent's use of the trademark LEERDAMMER in connection with the disputed domain name. The Respondent is identified in the disclosed registration data as "leerdammers OPC PVT LTD". However, the Complainant asserts that no company is registered under this name and that the Respondent adopted this name solely to claim an unjustified legitimate interest in the disputed domain name. As the Panel accepts the contentions of the Complainant as admitted by the Respondent, the Panel notes that the selection of a registrant name that mirrors the disputed domain name, where that name does not correspond to any legitimate entity, does not establish that the Respondent is "commonly known by" the domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and is not related in any way with the Complainant. Neither licence nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Complainant's trademark LEERDAMMER or to apply for registration of the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the disputed domain name is a typosquatted version of the trademark LEERDAMMER. Typosquatting is the practice of registering a domain name in an attempt to take advantage of Internet users' typographical errors and itself constitutes evidence that a respondent lacks rights and legitimate interests in the domain name (see *The Hackett Group, Inc. v. Brian Hems / The Hackett Group*, NAF Case No. FA 1597465).

The disputed domain name resolves to a website under construction. This lack of content further demonstrates the absence of a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Although given the opportunity, the Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie case. There is no evidence in the case file indicating that the Respondent has any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

III. The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in Bad Faith

The Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

The Complainant's LEERDAMMER trademark has been in use since 1974 and has been registered as a trademark since 1981. LEERDAMMER is one of Europe's most iconic cheese brands. A search for the term "leerdammers" refers exclusively to the Complainant and its products, demonstrating the strong distinctive character and well-known status of the LEERDAMMER trademark.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 29, 2026, i.e. more than 44 years after the Complainant first registered the LEERDAMMER trademark and 30 years after the Complainant registered its domain name <leerdammer.com>. In view of the well-known character and long-standing worldwide use of the LEERDAMMER trademark, it is inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's trademark rights. Given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademarks and reputation, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent registered the domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks.

The deliberate misspelling of the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain name constitutes typosquatting. Previous UDRP panels have consistently held that such actions constitute evidence of bad faith registration and use.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website under construction. The Panel finds that the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith. The incorporation of a famous mark into a domain name, coupled with an inactive website, may constitute evidence of bad faith registration and use where 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.

The Panel further notes the suspicious circumstance that the Respondent registered under the name "leerdammers OPC PVT LTD", a name which the Complainant asserts does not correspond to any registered company. The adoption of a registrant name that mirrors the disputed domain name – which is itself a typosquatted version of the Complainant's trademark – further supports the

inference of bad faith.

In the present case, given the well-known character of the LEERDAMMER trademark, the fact that the disputed domain name is a clear typosquatting variation of that mark, the absence of any conceivable legitimate use, and the Respondent's failure to provide any explanation or justification for the registration, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Respondent has not provided any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith registration or use of the disputed domain name that could refute this prima facie assessment.

IV. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

- 1. leerdammers.com: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Dominik Eickemeier
------	--------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-09-09

Publish the Decision