Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-109047

Case number	CAC-UDRP-109047
Time of filing	2026-10-09 14:02:22
Domain names	siemeens.tokyo, siemenss-heaithlneers.cc

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Siemens Trademark GmbH & Co. KG

Respondents

Organization	dskjd DSDD / NIL
Organization	wa ha ha / NIL

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 names.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant is the registered owner of multiple trademark registrations for the names "SIEMENS" and "SIEMENS Healthineers", including in particular the following trademark registrations:

1. SIEMENS (word), International WIPO Registration No. 637074, registered on 31 March 1995, covering more than 60 countries worldwide and registered for goods and services international classes 9, 10, 35, 37, and 42;
2. SIEMENS Healthineers (fig.), International WIPO Registration No. 1357232, registered on 25 October 2016, designating various territories and registered for goods and services in international classes 5, 9, 10, 35, 37, 42, and 44.

The Complainant is also the owner of numerous other national and international trademark registrations protecting the terms "SIEMENS" and "SIEMENS Healthineers".

Collectively, the above trademarks are referred to as the "**Complainant's Trademarks**".

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The **Complainant**, Siemens Trademark GmbH & Co. KG, is a trademark holding company acting as a subsidiary of Siemens Aktiengesellschaft, the ultimate mother company of the Siemens Group.

Headquartered in Berlin and Munich, the Siemens Group is one of the world's largest corporations, with a history spanning more than 175 years. The group operates in 190 countries, employing over 310,000 people worldwide, and reported a total turnover of EUR 78.9 billion in 2025. The Complainant licenses its globally renowned trademarks—including "SIEMENS" and "SIEMENS Healthineers"—across various sectors such as medicine, automation, power, transportation, and information technology.

Siemens Healthineers, an affiliated company within the Siemens Group, is one of the largest manufacturers of medical equipment globally, maintaining approximately 74,000 employees and a presence in over 70 countries.

The **disputed domain names** were registered as follows:

1. <siemenss-heaithlneers.cc> was registered on September 10, 2026; and
2. <siemeens.tokyo> was registered on September 18, 2026.

Prior to takedown measures initiated by the Complainant, both **disputed domain names resolved to** identical websites that impersonated the official web presence of Siemens Healthineers AG, reproducing its name, logos, official branding, and imagery.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

A) CONFUSING SIMILARITY

The Complainant states that:

- Despite the minor alterations, the Complainant's distinctive trademarks remain clearly recognizable within both disputed domain names.
- Both disputed domain names consist of obvious and intentional misspellings (typosquatting) targeting the Complainant's marks:
  - <siemeens.tokyo> incorporates the famous "SIEMENS" mark with the mere addition of a second letter "e" ("siemeens").
  - <siemenss-heaithlneers.cc> reproduces the "SIEMENS Healthineers" mark with minor alterations—a doubled "s" ("siemenss") and an interchange of letters "l" and "i" ("heaithlneers") designed to go unnoticed by internet users.
- The top-level domains (.tokyo and .cc) are standard technical requirements and must be disregarded when assessing confusing similarity.

B) NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant states that:

- The Respondent is not and has never been a representative, employee, licensee, or authorized user of the Complainant, nor has any connection ever been established between the Respondent and the Complainant or its affiliates.
- The Respondent has never been commonly known by the disputed domain names.
- The disputed domain names were active and hosted identical websites that impersonated the official website of Siemens Healthineers AG, reproducing its name, logo, branding, and imagery.
- Given the global renown of the "SIEMENS" mark, the deliberate use of typosquatted domains carries an inherent risk of implied affiliation, which reflects the Respondent's actual intent to trade upon the goodwill of the Complainant’s (Siemens) Group rather than make any legitimate non-commercial or fair use

C) BAD FAITH REGISTRATION AND USE

The Complainant states that:

- Bad Faith Registration:
  - Given the longstanding global reputation and widespread renown of the "SIEMENS" and "SIEMENS Healthineers" trademarks, it is evident that the Respondent had full knowledge of the Complainant's earlier rights when registering the disputed domain names.
  - The deliberate selection of typosquatted domains ("siemeens.tokyo" and "siemenss-heaithlneers.cc") was specifically designed to exploit the strong global reputation of the Complainant's trademarks, target Internet users' typing or reading errors, and disrupt the Complainant's business.

    - The coordinated registration of multiple domains within a short eight-day window through the same registrar, using parallel DNS configurations and fictitious registrant details, further evidences bad faith intent.
- Bad Faith Use:
    - The Respondent actively used the disputed domain names to host identical websites impersonating Siemens Healthineers AG, reproducing official branding, logos, and imagery to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion.
    - Even though the disputed domain names were subsequently deactivated through the Complainant's takedown efforts, the prior fraudulent active use constitutes bad faith, and the subsequent passive holding of the domains does not cure this abuse.
    - The complete lack of verifiable or accurate contact information in the WHOIS database (using false names, placeholder telephone numbers, and non-postal addresses) further highlights the Respondent's bad faith.

RESPONDENT:

The Respondent has not provided any response to the Complaint.

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).

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 names (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown that 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).

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.

Consolidation Request

The Complainant has filed a request for consolidation.

Pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), the Panel has discretion to consolidate multiple domain name disputes. Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules further provides that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name if registered by the same domain name holder.

Where multiple domain names appear under different registrant names, consolidation is appropriate if the complainant establishes that (i) the disputed domain names are subject to common control, and (ii) consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.11.2).

Common Control

The Panel grants consolidation based on the following indicia of common control:

- Both disputed domain names resolved, prior to takedown, to identical websites impersonating Siemens Healthineers.
- Both were registered through Gname.com Pte. Ltd. within an eight-day window (September 10 and September 18, 2026).
- Both target the Complainant's marks ("SIEMENS" and "SIEMENS Healthineers") by doubling letters ("siemeens", "siemenss") and misspelling Healthineers ("heaithIneers").
- Both use nameservers from the same DNS provider with parallel patterns (a.share-dns.com / b.share-dns.net and a5.share-

dns.com / b5.share-dns.net).
- Both use nonsense names ("dskjd DSDD", "wa ha ha"), "Company: NIL", sequential Singapore phone numbers, non-postal romanized addresses, and similar outlook.com email formats.

These technical, temporal, structural, and behavioral commonalities support the reasonable inference, on the balance of probabilities, that both disputed domain names are under common control.

Fairness and Equity

Consolidation is fair and equitable to all parties. Both domains are held with the same Registrar under an English registration agreement, raising no procedural or linguistic disadvantage, and each Respondent has received notice. The Respondents have not rebutted the assertions of common control. Conversely, consolidation promotes procedural efficiency, avoids duplicated costs, removes the risk of inconsistent decisions, and reflects a single abusive scheme.

Conclusion on Consolidation

The requirements for consolidation under paragraph 10(e) of the Rules and section 4.11.2 of WIPO Overview 3.1 are satisfied. The Complainant's request to consolidate the disputes into a single proceeding is granted.

For case management purposes, the Panel will refer to the Respondents collectively as "the Respondent."

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

A) COMPLAINANT'S RIGHTS AND CONFUSING SIMILARITY

The first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark(s) and the disputed domain name(s).

This test typically involves a side-by-side comparison of the domain name and the textual components of the relevant trademark to assess whether the trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name.

In cases where a disputed domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in such domain name, the disputed domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that trademark for purposes of UDRP standing.

Where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element.

Applying the principles, the Panel finds that the incorporation of the Complainant's marks into the disputed domain names (regardless if in misspelled or typosquatted variants "siemeens" and "siemenss-heaithIneers") constitutes confusing similarity.

The minor alterations, such as doubling letters ("siemeens", "siemenss") or swapping visually nearly indistinguishable letters ("I" and "i" in "heaithIneers"), are designed precisely to go unnoticed by Internet users and do not prevent the Complainant's marks from being clearly recognizable.

For the sake of completeness, the Panel asserts that the top-level suffixes in the disputed domain names (i.e. the .tokyo and .cc) as well as standard technical formatting conventions (such as hyphens) must be disregarded under the identity and confusing similarity tests as they are necessary technical requirements of registration.

Consequently, the disputed domain names are 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).

B) NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

The Complainant shows that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed names and has never been affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant. The burden therefore shifts to the Respondent to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests under Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

The Panel further notes that the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant and has received no authorization, consent, or acquiescence to use the Complainant's trademarks in any manner, including as part of the disputed domain names.

The Respondent used the disputed domain names to host identical websites that impersonated the official web presence of Siemens Healthineers AG, reproducing its name, logo, branding, and imagery. Per section 2.13.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, the use of a domain name for illegal activity, such as impersonation or passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.

Furthermore, given the global renown of the "SIEMENS" mark, the deliberate use of typosquatted domains carries an inherent risk of implied affiliation, demonstrating the Respondent's intent to trade upon the goodwill of the Siemens Group rather than make any legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

The Respondent has failed to submit any response or otherwise provide evidence to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case or to demonstrate any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C) BAD FAITH

The Policy requires a finding of bad faith where a domain name is both registered and used in bad faith (paragraph 4(a)(iii)). The Panel considers the totality of circumstances in this case and finds that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

(i) Bad Faith Registration

The Complainant's Trademarks possess an extensive global reputation and a well-established commercial presence, with foundational trademark registrations predating the registration of the disputed domain names in September 2026 by many decades.

Given the widespread renown of the Complainant's Trademarks, alongside the ease with which the Complainant's rights can be verified through standard trademark registers, it is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's brand at the time of registration.

This prior knowledge is further evidenced by the deliberate composition of the disputed domain names. By incorporating the "SIEMENS" and "SIEMENS Healthineers" marks in intentional typosquatted variations ("siemeens" and "siemenss-heaithlneers"), the Respondent directly targeted the Complainant's brand.

This coordinated registration of multiple domains within a narrow eight-day window through the same registrar, utilizing parallel DNS configurations and fictitious registrant details, was designed to evoke official platforms and exploit the Complainant's goodwill, demonstrating clear intentional targeting at the time of the dispute domain names registration.

(ii) Bad Faith Use

The Respondent's conduct falls squarely within Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, as it intentionally used the disputed domain names to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a high likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

Prior to their takedown, the disputed domain names resolved to identical active websites that impersonated the official web presence of Siemens Healthineers AG, reproducing its name, logo, branding, and imagery.

Prior active bad-faith use is established, and subsequent takedown or deactivation by the Complainant cannot cure or mitigate it. Furthermore, panels have consistently found that the passive holding of a domain name under such circumstances amounts to use in bad faith.

The complete lack of verifiable or accurate contact information in the WHOIS database (utilizing nonsense names, placeholder telephone numbers, and non-postal addresses) further corroborates the Respondent's bad faith

(iii) Conclusion

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain names have been both registered and used in bad faith within the meaning of 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. **siemeens.tokyo**: Transferred
2. **siemenss-heaithlneers.cc**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Jiří Čermák

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-11-18

Publish the Decision