

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108983

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108983
-------------	-----------------

Time of filing	2026-09-09 09:34:13
----------------	---------------------

Domain names	frontlineuk.store
--------------	-------------------

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)
------	-----------------------------

Complainant

Organization	Boehringer Ingelheim Animal Health France
--------------	---

Complainant representative

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

Respondent

Name	Shopify Pro
------	-------------

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 trademark registrations for FRONTLINE, including International Trademark Registration No. 621912, registered on June 9, 1994, in Class 5, and International Trademark Registration No. 1245236, registered on January 30, 2015 in Classes 3 and 5.

The FRONTLINE trademark is used in connection with veterinary products, including flea and tick treatment products for pets.

The Complainant also owns and uses the domain name <frontline.com>, registered on January 28, 1999.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, Boehringer Ingelheim Animal Health France, is part of the Boehringer Ingelheim group, a global pharmaceutical group operating, inter alia, in the field of animal health.

The disputed domain name <frontlineuk.store> was registered on May 4, 2026. According to the Registrar's verification, the registrant is identified as "Shopify Pro", with an address in Glasgow, United Kingdom.

According to a screenshot dated September 7, 2026 submitted by the Complainant as Annex 6 to the Complaint, the disputed

domain name resolved at that time to an online store offering for sale products bearing the Complainant's FRONTLINE trademark. The website prominently used the FRONTLINE trademark and presented itself under the name "Frontline". The screenshot does not display any disclaimer or other statement identifying the operator of the website as independent of, or unaffiliated with, the Complainant. Rather, the website displays the following copyright notice, "© 2026, FrontlineUk Powered by FrontlineUk".

In accordance with the Panel's limited powers of independent investigation under paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel attempted to access the website at the disputed domain name on October 3, 2026. At that time, the disputed domain name returned a Cloudflare "Error 1001 – DNS resolution error" page and the online store evidenced in Annex 6 was no longer accessible.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT

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

First UDRP element – the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark

The Complainant contends that it owns longstanding registered rights in the FRONTLINE trademark which substantially predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name incorporates the FRONTLINE trademark in its entirety, merely adding the geographic abbreviation "uk". The Complainant submits that this addition does not prevent the FRONTLINE trademark from remaining clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name and therefore does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant further submits that the ".store" generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") should be disregarded for the purposes of the confusing similarity assessment.

Second UDRP element – the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name

The Complainant contends that it has never licensed, authorized or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the FRONTLINE trademark or to register any domain name incorporating that trademark, and that no commercial relationship exists between the parties.

The Complainant further contends that there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name resolved to a commercial website offering for sale FRONTLINE branded products at discounted prices.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name and corresponding website in a manner calculated to disrupt the Complainant's business and to attract users by impersonating the Complainant.

Third UDRP element – the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith

The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of and in order to target the Complainant and its FRONTLINE trademark.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent's knowledge of the Complainant is demonstrated by its use of the disputed domain name specifically to offer products bearing the FRONTLINE trademark at discounted prices.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the FRONTLINE trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website and the products offered on it.

The foregoing facts and arguments asserted by the Complainant are uncontested because no Response was filed.

RESPONDENT

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

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

THREE ELEMENTS THE COMPLAINANT MUST ESTABLISH UNDER THE POLICY

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that a domain name should be transferred or cancelled:

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

The Panel has examined the evidence available to it and has come to the following conclusions concerning the satisfaction of the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy in these proceedings:

(A) THE COMPLAINANT'S RIGHTS AND CONFUSING SIMILARITY OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME TO THE COMPLAINANT'S RIGHTS

The Complainant has demonstrated registered trademark rights in the FRONTLINE trademark. These trademark rights substantially predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

A registered trademark constitutes sufficient evidence of rights for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant possesses rights in the FRONTLINE trademark.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's FRONTLINE trademark in its entirety, with the mere addition of the geographic abbreviation "uk". The FRONTLINE trademark therefore remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

It is well established that where a domain name wholly incorporates a complainant's trademark, the addition of a geographic or other term will generally not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The ".store" gTLD is generally disregarded for the purposes of the confusing similarity assessment as it is a technical requirement of domain name registration.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights and that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

(B) THE RESPONDENT'S LACK OF RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS IN THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME

The second element of the Policy requires that the Complainant establishes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The generally adopted approach, when considering the second element, is that if a complainant makes out a prima facie case, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to rebut it; see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 2.1.

However, the burden of proof remains with the Complainant to make out its prima facie case on a balance of probabilities. Moreover, simply establishing that the Complainant has rights in the corresponding trademark is insufficient.

As a preliminary point, the Complainant states that it has not authorized, licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the

FRONTLINE trademark or to register the disputed domain name, and that no relationship exists between the parties.

Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy contemplates an examination of the available facts to determine whether a respondent has rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. Paragraph 4(c) sets out a list of circumstances through which a respondent may demonstrate that it does have such rights or interests.

The first circumstance, under paragraph 4(c)(i), is where, before any notice of the dispute, the respondent used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Here, according to the screenshot dated September 7, 2026 submitted by the Complainant as Annex 6, the disputed domain name resolved to a commercial website operating under the names "Frontline" and "Frontline UK" and offering for sale products bearing the Complainant's FRONTLINE trademark.

The Panel has considered whether the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to offer FRONTLINE branded products for sale could give rise to rights or legitimate interests under the principles established in the Oki Data test (Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc., WIPO Case No. D2001-0903). The evidence before the Panel does not support such a finding.

As summarized in section 2.8.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, the Oki Data test generally requires that: (i) the respondent actually be offering the goods or services at issue; (ii) the respondent use the site to sell only the trademarked goods or services; (iii) the site accurately and prominently disclose the registrant's relationship with the trademark holder; and (iv) the respondent not seek to "corner the market" in domain names reflecting the trademark. These requirements are cumulative.

Even assuming, for the purposes of this analysis, that the products offered through the Respondent's website were genuine FRONTLINE products, the Respondent does not satisfy the Oki Data test.

In particular, Annex 6 contains no disclaimer or other statement accurately and prominently disclosing the Respondent's relationship, or lack of relationship, with the Complainant. To the contrary, the disputed domain name combines the Complainant's FRONTLINE trademark with the geographic abbreviation "uk", while the website itself is presented under the names "Frontline" and "Frontline UK". The website also displays the copyright notice "© 2026, FrontlineUk Powered by FrontlineUk". Taken together, these circumstances create the impression that the website is operated by, or officially affiliated with, the Complainant, rather than by an independent reseller.

As reflected in sections 2.5.1 and 2.8.2 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, the composition of the disputed domain name itself is also relevant to the assessment of fair use. Here, the combination of the FRONTLINE trademark with the geographic abbreviation "uk" carries a risk of implied affiliation, which is reinforced by the presentation of the corresponding website and the absence of any disclaimer.

Accordingly, the Panel finds no evidence of a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) under the Policy.

The second circumstance, under paragraph 4(c)(ii), concerns cases where the Respondent is commonly known by the domain name. Here, according to the Registrar verification, the Respondent is identified as "Shopify Pro", with an address in Glasgow, Scotland. This name bears no apparent connection to the disputed domain name and there is no evidence before the Panel that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The third circumstance, under paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy, provides that a respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests where there is legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

Here, Annex 6 shows that the disputed domain name was used for a commercial online store offering FRONTLINE branded products for sale. Such commercial use, in the circumstances described above, does not constitute legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes that the website was no longer accessible when it attempted to visit the disputed domain name on October 3, 2026. This subsequent change does not establish rights or legitimate interests on the part of the Respondent, nor does it displace the evidence of the Respondent's prior use.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The burden of production therefore shifts to the Respondent. As the Respondent has not participated in these proceedings, there is no rebuttal to consider.

Having considered the evidence before it, the Panel concludes, on the balance of probabilities, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has therefore satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

(C) BAD FAITH REGISTRATION AND USE OF THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME

The third element requires the Complainant to show that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a non-exhaustive list of four circumstances, any one of which may be evidence of the

registration and use of a domain name in bad faith. Of particular relevance to the facts of this case is paragraph 4(b)(iv), which provides evidence of bad faith where:

“by using the domain name, [the respondent has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent’s] web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the respondent’s] web site or location or of a product or service on [the respondent’s] web site or location.”

The Panel finds that the Complainant has shown that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith, for the reasons set out below.

- 1. The Complainant's FRONTLINE trademark rights substantially predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant's cited International Trademark Registration No. 621912 dates from 1994, whereas the disputed domain name was registered on May 4, 2026.
- 2. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's FRONTLINE trademark in its entirety, merely adding the geographic abbreviation "uk" and the ".store" gTLD. The composition of the disputed domain name is consistent with an intention to evoke an official United Kingdom presence for the Complainant's FRONTLINE brand.
- 3. Most significantly, the Respondent’s actual use of the disputed domain name establishes its knowledge of, and intention to target, the Complainant and its trademark. According to Annex 6, the Respondent used the disputed domain name for a commercial website offering products bearing the FRONTLINE trademark and presenting itself under the names "Frontline" and "Frontline UK". The website prominently displayed the FRONTLINE trademark, without any disclaimer or other statement informing Internet users that it was independently operated or unaffiliated with the Complainant. Taken together, the disputed domain name and the content of the corresponding website created the false impression that the website represented an official or authorized United Kingdom presence of the Complainant.
- 4. The Panel finds that, by using the disputed domain name in this manner, the Respondent intentionally sought to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's FRONTLINE trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website and the products offered on it. Such conduct falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Panel does not need to determine whether the products offered through the website were genuine. Even assuming that they were, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name and the misleading presentation of the corresponding website are sufficient, in the circumstances of this case, to support a finding of bad faith.
- 5. As noted above, the website was no longer accessible when the Panel attempted to visit the disputed domain name on October 3, 2026. This subsequent change does not alter the evidence of the Respondent's prior bad-faith use. Further, the Respondent has not participated in these proceedings and has therefore provided no explanation or evidence capable of rebutting the Complainant's case.

Considering the totality of the circumstances, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant has therefore satisfied 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. **frontlineuk.store**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Claire Kowarsky
------	-----------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-10-09

Publish the Decision