Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108951

Case number	**CAC-UDRP-108951**
Time of filing	**2026-08-28 08:33:19**
Domain names	**adobe-download.com, adobe-get.com**

Case administrator

Name	**Olga Slanařová (Case admin)**

Complainant

Organization	**Adobe Inc.**

Complainant representative

Organization	**Convey srl**

Respondents

Organization	**Herman**
Organization	**FlowerTime**

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

Among the trademark portfolio of the Complainant, the following are the most notable:

- EU TM n. 009595356 – “ADOBE” – Nice 9, 35, 42;
- US TM n. 1475793 – “ADOBE” – Nice 9;
- EU TM n. 018316507 – "" – Nice Cl. 9, 35, 42;
- EU TM n. 018316508 – "" – Nice Cl. 9, 35, 42;
- US TM n. 1901149 – “A ADOBE” – "" – Nice 9;
- EU TM n. 000202770 – “” – Nice Cl. 9, 38, 42;
- EU TM n. 018912910 – “” – Nice Cl. 9, 45, 38, 41, 42;
- US TM n. 77490633 - Nice Cl. 9;
- US TM n. 77490691 - Nice Cl. 42;
- US TM n. 97794697 – “ACROBAT” – Nice Cl. 9, 42.

The above exemplificative and non-exhaustive list of trademarks, including “ADOBE” has been registered and actively used by the Complainant for a considerable period of time. These trademarks are highly distinctive and widely recognized in the fields of digital media, software development, photography, and creative content production, and are uniquely associated with the Complainant and its products worldwide.

The disputed domain names were registered by the Respondent on March 30, 2026, without the Complainant's authorization.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a leading global technology company specializing in the development of software and digital media solutions. Since its establishment in 1982, the Complainant has played a pioneering role in shaping the digital content industry, offering innovative tools that enable individuals and businesses to create, manage, and deliver digital content. Over the years, the Complainant has established a strong international presence and built a highly recognized and reputable brand associated with innovation, quality, and creativity in digital space.

The Complainant is a globally active technology company whose products and services are used across multiple markets and industries worldwide. As reflected in its corporate profile, the Complainant operates on a global scale by providing a comprehensive range of solutions that enable individuals, businesses, and organizations to create, manage, distribute, and optimize digital content and customer experiences. These solutions serve a broad and diverse user base, including creative professionals, enterprises, marketers, and consumers, thereby reinforcing the Complainant's extensive international presence and its role as a key player in the global digital ecosystem.

The Complainant is widely recognized as one of the world's leading companies in the development of professional software for digital media creation, publishing, and communication. The Complainant offers a comprehensive portfolio of industry-standard applications, including, inter alia, Adobe Photoshop for image editing, Adobe Illustrator for vector graphics, Adobe Premiere Pro and Adobe After Effects for video editing and compositing, and Adobe InDesign for digital publishing. These products are extensively used by professionals, enterprises, and organizations worldwide, and have become indispensable tools within their respective industries. Furthermore, the Complainant has played a pivotal and foundational role in the evolution of digital documentation through the development of the Portable Document Format ("PDF"), which has become a globally recognized standard enabling the reliable and consistent exchange of documents across different platforms and operating systems.

Among the Complainant's principal products, Adobe Photoshop is a widely known software application for digital image editing and manipulation. First developed in the late 1980s and commercially released in 1990, Photoshop has been progressively adopted across a broad range of sectors, including publishing, advertising, web design, film production, and other creative industries. The software provides a comprehensive set of tools for the processing and modification of raster images, including functionalities such as layered editing, image compositing, and advanced color management.

Over time, Photoshop has achieved a particularly high degree of recognition among both professionals and the general public, reflecting its extensive use in everyday digital imaging practices. Its name has entered common language as a reference to image editing processes, which further demonstrates its level of diffusion and public awareness. As a result, Photoshop constitutes a well-established and widely recognized component of the Complainant's software portfolio, contributing significantly to Adobe's presence in the global digital media sector.

With more than thirty-five years of continuous commercial use, Adobe Photoshop has become one of the most widely recognized image editing software applications worldwide. Throughout this period, it has been consistently promoted and distributed by the Complainant, contributing to its widespread adoption and public recognition. The high degree of recognition associated with Photoshop is further evidenced by the fact that the term "Photoshop" is frequently used in common language to refer to digital image editing more generally. The Complainant has taken active steps over time to protect and enforce its rights in the PHOTOSHOP mark, ensuring its continued distinctiveness and association with the Complainant's software products.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain names 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 names are confusingly similar to its trademark ADOBE and its associated domain names.

The Complainant contends that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names 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 Respondents.

Given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark and reputation, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondents have registered the domain names with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark. Furthermore, the disputed domain names are inactive. The Complainant contends that the Respondents have not demonstrated any activity in respect of the disputed domain names, and it is not possible to conceive of any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the disputed domain names by the Respondents 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 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 Policy)

This is a case of adding a hyphen and generic terms "get" and "download", after Complainant's trademark ADOBE, it is found that the disputed domain names <adobe-download.com> and <adobe-get.com> are confusingly similar to the Complainant´s trademark ADOBE.

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Respondents to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names (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 names have been registered and are 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 the Complainant's trademark ADOBE, it is inconceivable to the Panel in the current circumstances that the Respondents registered the disputed domain names without prior knowledge of the Complainant and the Complainant’s marks and domain names.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain names were registered in bad faith.

The incorporation of a well-known mark into a domain name, coupled with inactive websites, 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 names by the Respondents that would not be illegitimate, such as by being a passing off, an infringement of consumer protection legislation, a phishing purpose based on related MX-records, or an infringement of the Complainant’s rights under trademark law.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain names have been registered and are 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.

The complaint is filed against multiple Respondents, and this Panel considers, based on the arguments and evidence presented by the Complainant, and the lack of response to the contrary from the Respondents, that the disputed domain names or are under common control, and that the consolidation is fair and equitable to all parties.

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 names are confusingly similar to its trademark and its domain names. Indeed, the disputed domain names merely add a hyphen and generic terms behind the Complainant's trademark.

The disputed domain names are therefore deemed confusingly similar.

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

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

The Panel finds it inconceivable that the Respondents were unaware of the Complainant's trademark and domain names at the time of registering the disputed domain names and therefore finds that the disputed domain names were 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 names have been registered and are 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

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

1. **adobe-download.com**: Transferred
2. **adobe-get.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Lars Karnoe**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-09-29

Publish the Decision