Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108907

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108907
Time of filing	2026-08-06 10:35:59
Domain names	frontlineplus-spot-on.store

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Boehringer Ingelheim Animal Health France

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	jason roy

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 a portfolio of trademark registrations for FRONTLINE, including the international trademark FRONTLINE No. 621912, registered since June 9, 1994, covering veterinary antiparasitic products in class 5, and the international trademark FRONTLINE No. 1245236, registered since January 30, 2015, covering veterinary and cosmetic products in classes 3 and 5.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Boehringer Ingelheim Animal Health France (“Boehringer Ingelheim” or “Complainant”) is part of the Boehringer Ingelheim group, a global leader in the animal health industry founded in 1885. The Complainant markets FRONTLINE, a line of veterinary antiparasitic products indicated for the treatment and prevention of fleas, ticks and chewing lice in dogs and cats, with the FRONTLINE PLUS variant additionally breaking the flea life cycle by preventing the development of immature stages.

The Complainant is marketing its goods online through the domain name <frontline.com>, registered on January 28, 1999.

The disputed domain name <frontlineplus-spot-on.store> was registered on May 28, 2026, and resolves to a website offering for

sale products bearing the Complainant's FRONTLINE mark.

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

The Panel agrees with the Complainant that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark FRONTLINE. The disputed domain name <frontlineplus-spot-on.store> wholly incorporates the trademark FRONTLINE, and the addition of the terms “plus”, “spot” and “on” is not sufficient to escape the finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark. On the contrary, these added terms do not merely fail to dispel the connection with the Complainant's business, but positively reinforce it, since “FRONTLINE PLUS” and “Spot-On” both correspond directly to the Complainant's own product line and application method (see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.8). The addition of the generic Top-Level Domain suffix “.store” does not alter this conclusion, as it is a standard registration requirement that is disregarded under the first element (see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.11).

On these bases, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

The Panel acknowledges that the Complainant presented prima facie evidence that the Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or permitted the Respondent to use its trademark FRONTLINE, nor to register the disputed domain name. Nothing in the record indicates that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the disputed domain name resolves to a website offering for sale products bearing the Complainant's mark, without any authorization from or affiliation with the Complainant, which does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

As the Respondent has failed to come forward with any evidence of rights or legitimate interests once the Complainant established a prima facie case, the Panel concludes that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant's trademark FRONTLINE is distinctive and has been registered and in continuous commercial use since 1994, more than three decades before the registration of the disputed domain name in 2026. Previous CAC panels have already recognized the strong reputation and well-known character of the Complainant's marks (see CAC Case No. 103184, Merial v.

Domain Administrator <frontlineplus.com> (“There is no question about the Complainant's rights. These are well-known marks [FRONTLINE® and FRONTLINE PLUS®] and have been for many decades. The mark, Frontline Plus, is reproduced in its entirety and can only reference the Complainant's most famous product.”)). Given the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's mark, and the fact that the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's own product branding in its entirety, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's rights (see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.1.4).

The disputed domain name resolves to a website offering for sale products bearing the Complainant's mark, without any authorization from or affiliation with the Complainant. Such use, by diverting Internet users seeking the Complainant's official channels to an unauthorized commercial website trading on the Complainant's goodwill, disrupts the Complainant's business and constitutes evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iii) of the Policy, and further demonstrates an intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

On these bases, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **frontlineplus-spot-on.store**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Darius Sauliūnas**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-09-16

Publish the Decision