

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sennheiser electronic GmbH & Co. KG v. Joyner Joyner
Case No. D2026-0045

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Sennheiser electronic GmbH & Co. KG, Germany, represented by Bettinger Scheffelt Partnerschaft mbB, Germany.

The Respondent is Joyner Joyner, United States of America (“United States”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sennheiserx.com> is registered with Cosmotown, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 7, 2026. On January 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 11, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 12, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on January 12, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 2, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Ahmet Akgüloğlu as the sole panelist in this matter on February 12, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant, Sennheiser electronic GmbH & Co. KG, is a Germany-based international company founded in 1945 as “Laboratorium Wennebostel”. The Complainant engages in the audio industry and specializes in the design and production of a variety of premium audio products, including microphones, headphones, wireless systems, monitor systems, telephone accessories, headsets, and audio solutions.

The Complainant, is the owner of several trademark registrations, such as the SENNHEISER European Union Trade Mark with registration number 000370122, registered in classes 9, 10, and 16 on August 27, 1999; SENNHEISER European Union Trade Mark with registration number 001594308, registered in classes 3, 9, 18, 21, 25, 28, 38, 41, and 42 on August 21, 2001; SENNHEISER (logo) International trademark with registration number 590780, registered in class 9 on August 10, 1992; and SENNHEISER International trademark with registration number 670839, registered in class 9 on March 6, 1997.

The Complainant also owns several domain names, inter alia, <sennheiser.com>, <sennheiser.net>, and <sennheisershop.com>, which are registered on April 24, 1996, August 18, 2003, and December 2, 2008, respectively. The domain names <sennheiser.net> and <sennheisershop.com> are redirected to the domain name <sennheiser.com>, where it is stated by the Complainant that its products and services are promoted in particular on this website.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 4, 2025, and consists of the terms “sennheiser” and “x”.

As mentioned by the Complainant, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that the products bearing SENNHEISER trademark and logo, such as monitor and wireless systems, headphones, meeting and conference systems, microphones, and accessories are displayed and offered for sale.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s SENNHEISER trademarks. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name incorporates the SENNHEISER trademark in its entirety. Additionally, the Complainant mentions that the mere addition of the letter “x” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity and that the addition of a single, non-distinctive character to a well-known trademark is a classic form of typo squatting which does not materially alter the overall impression conveyed by the domain name.

The Complainant states that although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized 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; therefore the settled case law under the Policy that, 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 (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant) and if the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element.

The Complainant states that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services, stating that the Complainant has neither licensed nor authorized the

Respondent to use its SENNHEISER trademark, and the Respondent is not affiliated with, nor has it ever been an authorized distributor, reseller, or partner of the Complainant. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or has acquired any trademark or trade name rights corresponding to it.

The Complainant adds that the Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services, stating that the disputed domain name resolves to a website that impersonates the Complainant by reproducing its trademark, product names, marketing content, and overall look and feel, while offering products from the similar categories (e.g. “Headphones”, “Microphones”, “Wireless Systems”) at implausibly low prices, and that such misleading use – particularly in the context of a fake online shop – cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services and does not confer any rights or legitimate interests under UDRP practice.

The Complainant also indicates that the disputed domain name of the Respondent was registered and used in bad faith, given that at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, the Complainant’s SENNHEISER trademark was well-known internationally and had been used extensively for decades in connection with audio equipment and related service, which is supported by the subsequent use of the domain name for a website impersonating the Complainant (in terms of the Complainant’s history, reputation, and brand positioning such as “Trusted by legends, loved by listeners” and references to the Complainant’s virtual tours and events), and offering purported SENNHEISER branded products for sale. Therefore, it was selected deliberately for targeting the Complainant’s trademark and constitutes classic typosquatting. It is also mentioned by the Complainant that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to operate a website that falsely presents itself as an official or authorized Sennheiser online shop and the website operates as a fake online shop.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs the Panel to “decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable”. Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the complainant prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that the disputed domain name should be transferred or cancelled:

(i) the disputed 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 disputed domain name; and (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Panel will proceed to analyze whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied in this proceeding.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that 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 and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. It is uncontested to the Panel that the Complainant also has rights to SENNHEISER trademark as a result of acquired reputation throughout the usage of the trademark globally.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of the letter “x” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such letter does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The Panel also ignored the generic Top Level-Domain (“gTLD”) since it is viewed as a standard registration requirement and suggested as disregarded under the first element similarity test. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Therefore, the disputed domain name directly includes and starts with SENNHEISER mark of the Complainant, with the addition of the letter “x” as well as the gTLD “.com”.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving that 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 (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

As noted, the addition of the letter “x” after the Complainant’s SENNHEISER trademark will not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, and the Respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions. It is accepted by the Panel that the Complainant has not licensed nor authorized the use of its trademark to the Respondent, and the Panel finds no indication that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name and the Respondent has not submitted any response to the Complaint in terms of any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name or the registered SENNHEISER trademarks. There is no evidence that either the Respondent’s activity through the disputed domain name constitutes fair use or the Respondent is making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The composition of the disputed domain name, coupled with its use for a website reproducing the Complainant’s SENNHEISER mark and logo in such a prominent manner, along with the Complainant’s images, would carry a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. The Panel notes that the Respondent’s disclaimer on the website resembles the Complainant’s website.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for sale of counterfeit goods, passing off, or other types of fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel also finds that the Respondent is using the website for fraudulent impersonation, and likely counterfeit sales purposes (noting the exceptionally discounted prices on the Respondent’s website), and the Respondent has not submitted any evidence to prove their bona fide usage of the disputed domain name. It is clear that the Respondent is trying to deceive the Internet users into sharing their information and buying likely counterfeit products bearing the SENNHEISER trademark by pretending to be or related to the Complainant.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent followed a pattern of bad faith conduct and registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of use with the intention to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

The disputed domain name was registered years later than the Complainant's several domain names and trademark registrations, and the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks and domain names. A domain name that includes a well-known trademark is suggestive of the respondent's bad faith. (See *PJ Hungary Szolgáltató Korlátolt Felelősségű Társaság v. Web Commerce Communications Limited, Client Care*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1345](#).)

According to the evidence provided by the Complainant, it is understood by the Panel that the Respondent, by taking unfair advantage of the Complainant's reputation, has offered for sale likely counterfeit products bearing the Complainant's trademark at significant discounts, through a website resembling that of the Complainant and containing information relating to the Complainant's trademark and products.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for the sale of counterfeit goods, passing off, or other types of fraud constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <sennheiserx.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ahmet Akgüloğlu/

Ahmet Akgüloğlu

Sole Panelist

Date: February 26, 2026