Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-109002

Case number	CAC-UDRP-109002
Time of filing	2026-09-23 09:15:37
Domain names	síemens.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Siemens Trademark GmbH & Co. KG

Respondent

Organization	Siemens Recruiter

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 a large portfolio of SIEMENS trademarks protected worldwide, including:

SIEMENS (world), international registration No. 637074 registered on March 31, 1995, covering goods and services in classes 01, 03, 05, 06, 07, 08, 09, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21, 28, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41 and 42.

Moreover, the Complainant is the owner of the domain name <siemens.com>, which resolves to its main website, where it advertises its activities.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a German company belonging to the Siemens Group. Founded 175 years ago, the Siemens Group is headquartered in Berlin and Munich and is one of the world's largest corporations. The Siemens Group's turnover in 2025 was EUR 78.8 billion, and the Group employs approximately 318,000 people worldwide.

The Complainant is active in various fields, including automation and control, power, transportation, logistics, information and communications technologies, medical technology, and related sectors.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 25, 2025, in the name of "Siemens Recruiter". The Respondent is allegedly located in India. The disputed domain name resolves to the Registrar's parking page.

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.

According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its SIEMENS trademark, as the only difference consists of the replacement of the letter "i" with the accented letter "ì". This difference is barely perceptible visually and is likely to go unnoticed by Internet users. As a result, consumers will perceive and pronounce the disputed domain name and the SIEMENS trademark in the same manner.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not, and has never been, a representative, employee, distributor, or licensee of the Complainant, nor has it ever been authorized by the Complainant to use the SIEMENS trademark. Furthermore, the Respondent has no affiliation, relationship, or connection whatsoever with the Complainant.

As the disputed domain name resolves to the Registrar's parking page, the Respondent is not using, and has not used, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Moreover, according to the Complainant, the Respondent has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name carries a high risk of implied affiliation, as it suggests an association with the Complainant and its SIEMENS trademark. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the intention of creating such an impression. Accordingly, the Complainant argues that the Respondent cannot be regarded as making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. that the Respondent cannot be considered to be making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Lastly, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant notes that its SIEMENS trademark has acquired a strong global reputation. By virtue of its long-standing and extensive use, the SIEMENS trademark is among the best-known trademarks in the world.

According to the Complainant, by deliberately registering the disputed domain name, which reproduces the famous SIEMENS trademark, the Respondent sought to capitalize on the reputation associated with that mark and to create a likelihood of confusion among Internet users. The Complainant further submits that, by registering the disputed domain name, the Respondent intended to take unfair advantage of the goodwill attached to the SIEMENS trademark and thereby disrupt the Complainant's business.

The disputed domain name is so closely similar to the Complainant's SIEMENS trademark and its domain names, including <siemens.com>, <siemens.eu>, <siemens.de>, and others, that it creates the false impression that it is another legitimate domain name owned and used by the Complainant or its affiliated companies.

The Complainant further notes that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name as part of email addresses to impersonate a purported Siemens talent acquisition specialist. According to the Complainant, the Respondent has been contacting prospective job applicants and misleading them into believing that they are participating in a recruitment process conducted by the Complainant, with the apparent aim of obtaining money and/or other commitments from them under the guise of recruitment and onboarding procedures.

The Complainant therefore maintains that the Respondent is knowingly engaging in fraudulent activities through the use of the disputed domain name.

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

I. Confusing Similarity

It is a well-established principle that the first element under the Policy involves a relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has demonstrated ownership of registered rights in the SIEMENS trademark in numerous jurisdictions. These trademark registrations predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name is a misspelling of the Complainant's mark, differing from it solely by the replacement of the letter "i" with the letter "ì". The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is almost identical to the Complainant's mark. A domain name consisting of a variation of a trademark (typically a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling, referred to as typosquatting) is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.9.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the first element of the Policy.

II. Rights or legitimate interests

Although the Complainant retains the ultimate burden of proof under the UDRP, panels have long recognized that requiring a complainant to demonstrate that a respondent has no rights or legitimate interests may amount to proving a negative, especially where the relevant facts are primarily within the respondent's knowledge. Therefore, where the complainant establishes a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to rebut that case with appropriate evidence. Should the respondent fail to do so, the complainant is generally regarded as having satisfied the second element of the Policy. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

In this case, the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the SIEMENS trademark, or any misspelling thereof, in any manner whatsoever, including as part of the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the Respondent is neither a licensee nor a representative of the Complainant, nor does it have any other relationship or connection with the Complainant.

Finally, although the disputed domain name was registered in the name of "Siemens Recruiter", this circumstance alone is insufficient to establish that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. To support such a claim, the Respondent would have been expected to provide specific and credible evidence. However, the Respondent chose not to rebut the Complainant's allegations and failed to provide any evidence of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, having elected not to submit a Response.

The disputed domain name resolves to the Registrar's parking page. Nevertheless, the evidence on record indicates that it has been used as part of email addresses incorporating the SIEMENS mark, purportedly by an individual claiming to work in Talent Acquisition within the Complainant's Human Resources department. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant and to send misleading communications to third parties for some illegitimate purposes.

Such use of the disputed domain name does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services. Nor can it be considered a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Complainant's SIEMENS trademark.

In light of the above, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the second element of the Policy.

III. Bad Faith

To succeed under the third element of the Policy, a complainant must prove that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used by the Respondent in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant's SIEMENS trademark enjoys a strong reputation and that the disputed domain name constitutes a typosquatted version of that trademark. The mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a well-known trademark, particularly where it consists of an obvious misspelling of the mark, may by itself give rise to a presumption of bad faith. This is especially so in the case of coined or fanciful trademarks, such as the SIEMENS trademark at issue in this proceeding.

Against this background, the Panel finds that the Respondent was most likely aware of the Complainant's rights in the SIEMENS trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name and deliberately targeted the Complainant and its trademark. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

As noted above, the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page operated by the Registrar. Moreover, the evidence on record shows that it has been used to send misleading emails to Internet users by an individual purporting to be a recruiter in the

Complainant's Human Resources Department. Such emails make unauthorized use of the Complainant's SIEMENS trademark. Although the ultimate purpose of these emails is not fully revealed by the evidence on record, it is evident to the Panel that sending deceptive emails to unsuspecting third parties while purporting to act on the Complainant's behalf, and leading them to believe that they are being considered for employment with the Complainant, is conduct likely to cause substantial harm not only to the goodwill and reputation associated with the Complainant and its renowned SIEMENS trademark, but also to the recipients of such communications, who may be induced to disclose personal information, incur expenses, or otherwise act to their detriment. Such conduct amounts to use of the disputed domain name in bad faith.

In light of the above, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. Accordingly, the third element of the Policy has been established.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **síemens.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Angelica Lodigiani**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-11-02

Publish the Decision