

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-109027

Case number	CAC-UDRP-109027
Time of filing	2026-09-29 10:25:57
Domain names	Info-eurex.com

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Deutsche Börse AG
--------------	-------------------

Complainant representative

Organization	Grünecker Patent und Rechtsanwälte PartG mbB
--------------	--

Respondent

Name	Susie Cobb
------	------------

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, inter alia, the owner of EU trademark registration no. 000744763 "EUREX", registered on June 8, 1999, in classes 9, 16, 35, 36, 38, and 42 (hereinafter referred to as the "Trademark"). The Trademark predates the registration date of the disputed domain name. In numerous UDRP decisions, panels have recognized the EUREX mark as well-known.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is one of the world's leading marketplace operators for financial services, specializing in the trading of shares and other securities. The Complainant is the parent company of Deutsche Börse Group, which includes Eurex Frankfurt AG (a 100% subsidiary) and Eurex Global Derivatives AG (a 100% subsidiary). As of December 31, 2022, the Complainant and its subsidiaries employed approximately 11,000 staff members across 55 locations worldwide, including offices in Luxembourg, Prague, Cork, London, New York, Chicago, Hong Kong, Singapore, Beijing, Tokyo, and Sydney. In addition, the Complainant collaborates with other exchange organizations to increase the efficiency of capital markets globally.

Among its operations, the Complainant operates one of the world's largest derivatives markets under the trademark EUREX and operates one of the world's leading clearinghouses through EUREX CLEARING. Since its inception in 1998, EUREX has rapidly become an integral part of the global derivatives market, regularly closing with record volumes of traded contracts—exceeding 1.8 billion contracts in 2024 alone. Today, more than 400 market participants from 32 countries are connected to the EUREX trading

system, and more than 8,000 traders are admitted to EUREX. The Complainant provides official information online at <eurex.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 17, 2026, and is used in connection with a standard placeholder website provided by the registrar, which contains advertising links to third parties' websites. In addition, MX servers are set up under the disputed domain name.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

The Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark because it contains the Trademark in its entirety and argues that the additional element "info" is descriptive and is not sufficient to distinguish the disputed domain name from the Trademark.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Specifically, the Complainant emphasizes that the Respondent was never authorized, licensed, or affiliated with the Complainant to use its EUREX trademarks. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor has it used the domain for a bona fide offering of goods or services or any legitimate noncommercial use. Instead, the disputed domain name incorporates the well-known EUREX mark alongside the prefix "info"—closely mimicking the Complainant's official contact email address (info@eurex.com). The Complainant asserts that the domain is designed to create a false impression of official affiliation and serves no conceivable purpose other than to impersonate the Complainant and target internet users with potential phishing or scam emails.

Finally, the Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered the domain name with full prior knowledge of the Complainant's well-known EUREX marks, intending to unfairly exploit their goodwill and reputation in the financial sector. Furthermore, the Complainant asserts that the domain is being used in bad faith despite hosting no active website content. Given the inclusion of the descriptive term "info" mimicking the Complainant's official contact email address and the active configuration of MX mail servers, the Complainant maintains that this passive holding presents an imminent risk of scam or phishing activities targeting unsuspecting internet users.

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

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

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the following three elements is present:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trade mark; 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.

1. The Panel acknowledges that the disputed domain name is indeed confusingly similar to the Trademark, as it fully incorporates the well-known Trademark. It is well established that a domain name that entirely incorporates a trade mark may still be considered confusingly similar to that trade mark under the Policy, despite the addition of descriptive additional terms as long as the trademark remains recognizable in the disputed domain name.

2. The Complainant has substantiated that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that the Complainant has fulfilled its obligations under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. The Respondent has not contested these assertions in any manner and, accordingly, has failed to demonstrate any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. On the basis of the evidence before the Panel, the Panel is likewise unable to discern any rights or legitimate interests on the part of the Respondent, as the disputed domain name is not generic and the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name does not indicate the existence of any rights or legitimate interests of its own.

3. The Panel is further satisfied that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant and its rights in the Trademark, given that the Trademark is well-established and has been used by a multinational corporation for decades.

With respect to bad faith use, the Panel finds that this is not a classic case of passive holding, in which the registrant has simply registered a domain name without using it in any other manner. Currently, the domain name is being used in connection with a registrar's website that contains promotional links to third-party offers. The fact that MX records are also configured at the disputed domain name demonstrates that the Respondent has in fact actively used the disputed domain name, at least for e-mail purposes. Given that the disputed domain name targets the Complainant and that the Trademark is very well established, the Panel considers it more likely than not that the Respondent has actually used or intended to use the disputed domain name in connection with fraudulent emails, which, as well as the use of the disputed domain name in connection with a website containing advertising links to third-party offers, constitutes evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iv) of the Policy. The Panel is therefore convinced that, even if the disputed domain name had not yet been actively used, the Respondent's non-use of the disputed domain name is tantamount to use in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

- 1. Info-eurex.com: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Peter Müller
------	--------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-10-28

Publish the Decision