Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108909

Case number	**CAC-UDRP-108909**
Time of filing	**2026-08-07 09:17:51**
Domain names	**lidl-lieferant.com**

Case administrator

Name	**Olga Slanařová (Case admin)**

Complainant

Organization	**Lidl Stiftung & Co. KG**

Complainant representative

Organization	**HK2 Rechtsanwälte**

Respondent

Organization	**FINANA**

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 the following trademarks for the denomination "LIDL":

Register	Type	No.	Date	Classes	Countries
EUIPO	Word	001778679	22.08.2002	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 39, 41, 42	EU
EUIPO	Fig.	013192752	27.02.2015	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44	EU

DPMA	Word	2006134	11.11.1991	29, 3, 5, 8, 11, 16, 18, 21, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33	DE
DPMA	Word	30009606	09.03.2000	35, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 39, 41, 42	DE
WIPO	Word	1541701	30.01.2020	01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 08, 09, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44	AU, CO, ID, KH, KR, MX, MY, NZ, SG, TM, US, AL, BA, BY, EG, IR, KG, KZ, ME, MK, RU, TJ, UA
WIPO	Fig.	1537891	30.01.2020	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44	AU, CO, ID, KH, KR, MX, MY, NZ, SG, TM, US, AL, BA, BY, IR, KG, KZ, ME, MK, RU, TJ, UA

("**Complainant's Trademarks**")

The disputed domain name <lidl-lieferant.com> was registered on 30 May 2026.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

As the Respondent did not file any response to the complaint, the Panel took into account the following facts asserted by the Complainant (and supported by the documentary evidence submitted by the Complainant) and unchallenged by the Respondent:

(a) The Complainant is one of the largest supermarket chains in Europe, operating more than 12,600 stores. Currently, its stores are primarily located in Europe and the United States.

(b) The Complainant is the owner of the Complainant's Trademarks.

(c) The disputed domain name was registered on 30 May 2026. It does not resolve to any active website. Only a default placeholder page of the hosting provider ("Something amazing will be constructed here...") is displayed.

(d) The disputed domain name is used for a fraudulent phishing scheme directed at prospective suppliers of the Complainant. On 21 July 2026, an email was sent to a German company in the name of "Lidl Stiftung & Co. KG", i.e. in the name of the Complainant. The email purports to originate from the Complainant's purchasing department and is signed by a "Michael Schneider, Stellvertretender Einkaufsleiter & Koordinator für Lieferantenregistrierung" (Deputy Head of Purchasing and Coordinator for Supplier Registration) – a person who does not exist within the Complainant's organization. The email reproduces the Complainant's genuine postal address and refers to the Complainant's official website www.lidl.de. Recipients are invited to take part in an alleged supplier registration process ("LIDL DEUTSCHLAND: REGISTRIERUNGSPROZESS FÜR HÄNDLER UND LIEFERANTEN"), to provide a company profile and to reply to the address info@lidl-lieferant.com – an email address under the disputed domain name.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

THE COMPLAINANT:

In addition to the above stated factual assertions, the Complainant also contends the following:

(i) The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's Trademarks as addition of generic term or descriptive terms such as as '"lieferant" (meaning "Supplier" in German language) to the disputed domain name does diminish confusing similarity.

(ii) The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant nor authorized by it in any way to use Complainant's Trademarks. The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent. There is no website under the disputed domain name and no indication of preparation for its use was established in these proceedings. Moreover, the disputed domain name has been used for fraudulent (phishing) activites, which clearly contradicts any legitimate interest of the Respondent. Therefore, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

(iii) Complainant's Trademarks are well-known, and there is no conceivable use that could be made of the disputed domain name

that would not amount to an infringement of the Complainant's trade mark rights. Moreover, the disputed domain name has been used for fraudulent (phishing) activities hence clearly in bad faith by the Respondent.

THE RESPONDENT:

The Respondent did not provide any response to the complaint.

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 Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy ("**UDRP**" or "**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

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainant proves each of the following three elements to obtain an order that the disputed domain name should be transferred or revoked:

(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 in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel will proceed to analyze whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied in these proceedings.

RIGHTS

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's Trademarks. It reproduces Complainant's Trademarks and mere addition of a non-distinctive term "lieferant" (meaning "Supplier" in the German language) cannot diminish the confusing similarity of the disputed domain name with Complainant`s Trademarks.

For the sake of completeness, the Panel asserts that the top-level suffix in the domain name (i.e. the ".com") must be disregarded under the identity / confusing similarity test as it is a necessary technical requirement of registration.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Complainant satisfied the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. Once such prima facie case is made, the Respondent carries the burden of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. If the Respondent fails to do so, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy (for example,

WIPO case no. D2003-0455, Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.).

As asserted by the Complainant (and unchallenged by the Respondent), the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. Neither is the Respondent in any way related to the Complainant. The Respondent failed to provide any information and evidence that it has relevant rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) (ii) of the Policy). Moreover, the Respondent clearly uses the disputed domain name for fraudulent purposes (phishing), which certainly cannot establish rights or legitimate interest of the Respondent in respect of the disputed domain name.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no right or legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

BAD FAITH

Given the reputation of the Complainant and the well-known nature of its trademarks, the Panel cannot find any conceivable good faith registration and use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent. Moreover, the disputed domain name has been used for phishing activities. Therefore, in the opinion of the Panel, the Respondent deliberately registered the disputed domain name which is confusingly similar to Complainant's Trademark, in order to mislead internet users and fraudulently collect and misuse their data.

As a result, the Panel found that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used by the Respondent in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **lidl-lieferant.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Michal Matějka**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-10-01

Publish the Decision