

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Alfred Kärcher SE & Co. KG v. The HIDI Trust
Case No. DAI2026-0005

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Alfred Kärcher SE & Co. KG, Germany, represented by Thomsen Trampedach GmbH, Switzerland.

The Respondent is The HIDI Trust, United States of America (“United States”), self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <karcher.ai> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 30, 2026. On February 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 2, 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 (Privacy User #8fd794d8, See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 4, 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 February 9, 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 February 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 2, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on February 10, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on February 12, 2026, confirming the filing of the Response.

The Center appointed Steven A. Maier as the sole panelist in this matter on February 16, 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 was founded in 1935. It is a developer and manufacturer of cleaning equipment, with operations, distribution and service networks worldwide.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for the mark KÄRCHER, including for example the following:

- European Union trademark registration number 000046516 for the word mark KÄRCHER, registered on June 15, 1998 in numerous International Classes;
- United States trademark registration number 1228155 for a combined mark KÄRCHER, registered on February 22, 1983 in numerous International Classes; and
- International trademark registration number 487467 for a figurative mark KÄRCHER, registered on August 18, 1984 in numerous International Classes.

The Complainant operates a website at “www.karcher.com”.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 16, 2025.

The Complainant exhibits a printout of an (undated) page from “Atom.com”, indicating that the disputed domain name is for sale, and specifying a “Buy Now” price of USD 295,000.

At the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to a Wikipedia page, stating that Karcher or Kärcher is a surname and listing notable people of that name. The page adds: “See also: Kärcher, a German cleaning equipment manufacturer best known for high-pressure cleaning products.”

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant submits that it is a global leader in cleaning technology, having been associated with the development and commercialization of high-pressure cleaners since 1950. It states that it currently has 17,000 employees, operates over 50,000 service centers, and recorded annual sales in excess of EUR 3.4 billion in 2025. The Complainant contends that its KÄRCHER trademark is well known, or widely known, by virtue of these matters.

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

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is identical to its trademark KÄRCHER, since it reproduces that mark in its entirety, and that the Top-Level Domain “.ai” is of no significance in making the relevant comparison.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. It states that it has no relationship with the Respondent and has never authorized it to use its KÄRCHER trademark, that the Respondent has not commonly been known by the disputed domain name,

and that the Respondent is making neither bona fide commercial use nor legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith. It contends that, since its KÄRCHER trademark is widely known, there is a presumption that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in order to take unfair advantage of it. It states that the Respondent either knew of its trademark or was willfully blind to it, since the top 10 results in a Google search against the term KARCHER all refer to the Complainant. It submits that the disputed domain name would inevitably create confusion with the Complainant in the minds of Internet users, and that the Respondent asking USD 295,000 for the disputed domain name can only be explained by an intention to sell it to the Complainant.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent states that it is a United States trust engaged in the lawful ownership, stewardship and management of digital assets, including domain names comprised of surnames, dictionary terms and acronyms.

The Respondent submits that the name KARCHER (or KÄRCHER) is not an exclusive identifier of the Complainant, and that it registered the disputed domain name as a surname borne by numerous individuals across different countries, professions and historical periods. It references the Wikipedia entry referred to above, which identifies politicians, scientists, artists, athletes and restaurateurs bearing that name.

The Respondent contends that publicly available trademark and corporate records reflect the fact that the name KARCHER is used in commerce by multiple entities in the United States and elsewhere (although it does not provide further details).

The Respondent states that the disputed domain name forms part of a broader portfolio of surname-based domain names (again it does not provide further details). It contends that it did not target the Complainant's trademark, and that the disputed domain name could demonstrably be used by multiple other parties in a variety of commercial contexts.

The Respondent submits that it has never used the disputed domain name to reference the Complainant's business, to attempt to impersonate the Complainant, to display advertising, or to derive any other commercial benefit from the Complainant's trademark. Nor has it ever solicited a sale to the Complainant.

The Respondent states that the ability to sell a domain name is not excluded from its lawful activities as a trust. It contends that offering a lawfully-held digital asset for sale does not constitute bad faith, and that the price at which the disputed domain name may have been offered does not indicate bad faith, absent proof that the disputed domain name was registered primarily to target the Complainant.

6. Discussion and Findings

In order to succeed in the Complaint, the Complainant is required to show that all three of the elements set out under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are present. Those elements are that:

- (i) the disputed 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 disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has established that it is the owner of registered trademark rights in respect of the mark KÄRCHER. The disputed domain name is identical to that trademark, ignoring both the umlaut over the letter "A" in the trademark and the Top-Level Domain ".ai", both of which may be disregarded for the purpose of comparison.

The first element under the Policy is therefore established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests, and C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel considers it appropriate in this case to consider the second and third elements under the Policy together, since similar factors will inform its conclusions in respect of both elements.

The Panel finds the Complainant's KÄRCHER trademark to be distinctive in nature, and to have become widely associated with the Complainant's products and services on an international basis. Moreover, the Panel does not accept the Respondent's contention that the mark KÄRCHER or KARCHER is widely used in commerce by other entities: for example, a search of the WIPO Global Brands Database against the term KARCHER returns 217 live trademark registrations, substantially all of which appear to relate to the Complainant, its associated entities or its licensees.¹ The Panel also accepts the Complainant's evidence that a relevant Google search yields results relating overwhelmingly to the Complainant.

The Panel does not accept in these circumstances that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name either in ignorance of the Complainant's trademark, or without intent to target that trademark for unfair commercial gain.

Insofar as the Respondent claims to have registered the disputed domain name for potential sale to someone of that surname, the Panel finds such claim to be improbable in any event, and absurd in the light of the Respondent's asking price of USD 295,000.

The fact that the Respondent later removed the disputed domain name from sale and redirected it to a Wikipedia page also implies bad faith in respect of the earlier use. The Panel concludes in the circumstances, on the balance of probabilities, that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with a view to selling it to the Complainant in the circumstances contemplated by paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

The Panel also finds that, in view of the widespread reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the lack of any other substantial commercial use of the mark by third parties, it is difficult to conceive of any good faith use that could be made of the disputed domain name other than by the Complainant.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and that disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The second and third elements under the Policy are consequently established.

¹ As discussed in section 4.8 of [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision.

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 <karcher.ai> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Steven A. Maier/

Steven A. Maier

Sole Panelist

Date: February 24, 2026