Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-109062

Case number	CAC-UDRP-109062
Time of filing	2026-10-09 09:40:04
Domain names	boehringer-inngelheim.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Boehringer Ingelheim Pharma GmbH & Co.KG

Complainant representative

Organization	NAMESHIELD S.A.S.

Respondent

Name	Katherine Morrell

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 number of trademark registrations for BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM (the "BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM trademark"), including the following representative registrations:

− the United States trademark BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM with registration No. 641166, registered on 5 February 1957 for goods in International Class 5; and

− the International trademark BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM. with registration No. 221544, registered on 2 July 1959 for goods in International Classes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 16, 17, 19, 29, 30 and 32.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a German family-owned pharmaceutical group of companies, founded in 1885. Over the years the Complainant has become a global research-driven pharmaceutical enterprise with about 54,500 employees and net sales of EUR 26,796 million in 2024.

The Complainant is the owner of the domain name <boehringer-ingelheim.com>, registered since 9 January 1995, which it uses for its official website.

There is no information about the Respondent in the case file.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 6, 2026 and redirects to the Complainant's official website at the domain name <boehringer-ingelheim.com>.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM trademark and to its domain name <boehringer-ingelheim.com>, because it reproduces them only by adding the additional letter "n", which creates a misspelling of the BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM trademark. According to the Complainant, this misspelling is characteristic of a typosquatting practice intended to create confusing similarity between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, because the Respondent is not related to the Complainant and does not carry out any joint activities with the Complainant, who is not authorised to use the BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM trademark or apply for registration of the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, by registering the disputed domain name, the Respondent attempts to take advantage of Internet users' typographical errors. The Complainant points out that the disputed domain name redirects to the Complainant's official website at the domain <boehringer-ingelheim.com>, and claims that this does not represent a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to the Complainant, the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant's trademark, and the disputed domain name was intentionally designed to be a confusingly similar misspelling of the BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM trademark. The Complainant maintains that the fact that the disputed domain name redirects to the Complainant's official website shows that the Respondent had knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark prior to the registration of the disputed domain name, and that it was registered by the Respondent in an effort to take advantage of the good reputation of the Complainant's trademark.

RESPONDENT:

The Respondent did not submit a Response in this proceeding.

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

Pursuant to the Policy, paragraph 4(a), a complainant must prove each of the following to justify the transfer of a domain name:

(i) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights;

(ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and

(iii) the respondent has registered and is using the domain name in bad faith.

Identical or confusingly similar

The Complainant has provided evidence and has thus established its rights in the BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM trademark.

The Panel notes that a common practice has emerged under the Policy to disregard in appropriate circumstances the general Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") section of domain names for the purposes of the comparison under the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i). The Panel sees no reason not to follow the same approach here, so it will disregard the ".com" gTLD section of the disputed domain name.

The relevant part of the disputed domain name is therefore the sequence "boehringer-inngelheim". As pointed out by the Complainant, it represents a mistyping of the BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM trademark, and the only difference is the additional letter "n" in the "inngelheim" element of the disputed domain name. The BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM trademark is easily recognised in the disputed domain name, and the additional letter does not preclude a finding of confusing similarity between the BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM trademark and the disputed domain name.

Taking all the above into account, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

Rights and legitimate interests

While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognised that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of "proving a negative", requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, because it is not associated to the Complainant and has not been authorised by the same to use the BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM trademark. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name is a typo-squatted version of the BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM trademark intended to confuse Internet users. The Complainant has thus established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has not submitted a Response and has not alleged that it has rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; it has not disputed the Complainant's allegations and evidence in this proceeding.

The disputed domain name is indeed confusingly similar to the Complainant's BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM trademark, and in the absence of any plausible explanation by the Respondent why it has chosen and registered the disputed domain name, it can only be regarded as a typo-squatted version of this trademark. The disputed domain name redirects to the Complainant's official website, which increases the likelihood of confusion and exposes Internet users to various risks who may be misled into thinking that the disputed domain name is affiliated to the Complainant.

The above leads the Panel to the conclusion that it is more likely than not that the Respondent, being aware of the goodwill of the Complainant and of the BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM trademark, has registered the disputed domain name in an attempt to exploit this trademark's goodwill by confusing Internet users. In the Panel's view, such activity is not legitimate and does not give rise to rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Bad faith

As discussed above, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM trademark and represents a typo-squatted version of it. It redirects visitors to the official website of the Complainant, which increases the likelihood of confusion and the risks for Internet users. In the absence of any plausible explanation by the Respondent why it has chosen and registered the disputed domain name, the Panel accepts as more likely that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant and targeting the BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM trademark in an attempt to extract commercial gain by misleading Internet users that the disputed domain name is affiliated to the Complainant.

This leads the Panel to the conclusion that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **boehringer-inngelheim.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Assen Alexiev**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-11-09

Publish the Decision