

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Deutscher Fußball-Bund (DFB) e.V. v. Claudia Kurherr, COGITATUM GmbH & Co. KG

Case No. DTV2026-0004

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Deutscher Fußball-Bund (DFB) e.V., Germany, represented by KLAKE Rauscher Rechtsanwälte Partnerschaft mbB, Germany.

The Respondent is Claudia Kurherr, COGITATUM GmbH & Co. KG, Germany.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <dfb.tv> is registered with eNom, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 1, 2026. On June 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 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 (Whois Agent (643747161), Whois Privacy Protection Service, Inc) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 3, 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 amendment to the Complaint on June 8, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 June 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 6, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on July 5, 2026. The Respondent sent the email communications to the Center on June 3, 2026, and June 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Kaya Köklü as the sole panelist in this matter on July 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 is the German Football Association, founded in 1900 and the official governing body for the football association in Germany. With more than eight million registered members, over 24,000 affiliated clubs and more than 140,000 teams, the Complainant is one of the largest national sports federations worldwide. The Complainant organizes, inter alia, the DFB-Pokal competition and administers the German national football teams. "DFB" is the well-known acronym of the Complainant's name and is widely recognized as referring to the Complainant.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous registered trademarks consisting of or containing the acronym DFB, including German Trademark Registration No. 30523036, registered on December 15, 2005, for DFB, covering, inter alia, telecommunications and sport activities including the organization of sports competitions in classes 38 and 41. Furthermore, the Complainant owns several figurative DFB trademarks in Germany (e.g., German Trademark Registration Nos. 39550426, 30427398, 302013030874, and 302025105665) as well as International Trademark Registrations (such as Nos. 852245, 1193095, and 1895447), all covering, inter alia, entertainment, sport activities and telecommunication respectively broadcasting services.

The Complainant operates, among others, its official website under the domain <dfb.de>. Under the subdomain <tv.dfb.de>, the Complainant offers its own streaming platform with football-related information and audiovisual content.

The disputed domain name <dfb.tv> was registered on May 2, 2007. According to the case file, the disputed domain name has not been actively used so far. However, based on undisputed documents provided by the Complainant, there is a configured Mail Exchange ("MX") email server for the disputed domain name, which enables the Respondent to send and receive emails using the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name was originally registered through the Respondent, a German company which was reorganized in 2024 and has meanwhile changed its name and address. It now operates under the name AMTP GmbH & Co. KG, based in Oberhausen, Germany. Commercial register extracts submitted by the Complainant and the Respondent confirm that the identified Respondent and AMTP GmbH & Co. KG are the same legal entity which merely changed its name and registered seat.

As submitted by the Complainant, on April 16 and 24, 2026, a third party individual contacted a representative of the Complainant by email in relation to the disputed domain name. In the email communication of April 16, 2026, this individual offered assistance to the Complainant in relation to a possible acquisition of the disputed domain name. The email correspondence between these two persons contains a number of personal remarks suggesting that the individuals involved are known and acquainted with one another. The email communication by this third party individual further includes a brief summary of the alleged circumstances surrounding the registration of the disputed domain name in 2007, in which the individual claims to have been involved in connection with a proposed broadcasting project with the Complainant. In his email communication of April 24, 2026, this individual informed the Complainant, who apparently made a bid for the disputed domain name, that the Respondent refused that offer, indicating at the same time that the Respondent asserts to have turned down offers in the past that were EUR 50.000 and higher.

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.

Particularly, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant notably argues that the Respondent, via a third party individual, has attempted to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant to an "exorbitant price" in significant excess of any conceivable out-of-pocket costs for the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied the second and third elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent particularly claims that it intends to use the disputed domain name in connection with training and promotional videos for a technology allegedly being developed under the designation "Dynamic Frame Balancing", abbreviated as "DFB".

The Respondent denies that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith. Instead, it submits that the disputed domain name was registered in 2007 in connection with a contemplated broadcasting project involving the Complainant and was intended to be used for a broadcasting website to be operated by the Complainant. In support of this assertion, the Respondent relies on contemporaneous email correspondence as well as recent statements from the third party individual (who approached the Complainant on April 16 and 24, 2026) and the former managing director of the Respondent, who both claim to have been involved in the project at the relevant time. According to the Respondent, the project was ultimately abandoned by the Complainant following internal discussions and commercial assessments. The Respondent further contends that the disputed domain name was at that time offered to be transferred to the Complainant free of charge, but that the Complainant did not take up that offer, allegedly because of the high registration and maintenance costs associated with the disputed domain name.

As regards the Complainant's allegation of bad faith use, the Respondent further contends that it has never made any active use of the disputed domain name and has never offered it for sale to the Complainant. According to the Respondent, it was instead the Complainant that approached the Respondent with a proposal to acquire the disputed domain name through the already above mentioned third party individual.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Identity of the Respondent

The Panel notes that, although the Complaint was filed against COGITATUM GmbH & Co. KG as the Respondent, it is undisputed between the Parties that this company has meanwhile changed its corporate name and registered seat, and now operates under the name AMTP GmbH & Co. KG. Based on the commercial register extracts submitted by both Parties, the Panel is satisfied that COGITATUM GmbH & Co. KG and AMTP GmbH & Co. KG are the same legal entity. The changes relate solely to the company's corporate name, registered office and ownership structure following a reorganization in 2024.

Accordingly, unless the context requires otherwise, references in this Decision to the Respondent shall be understood as referring to the same legal entity, irrespective of whether it operated under the name COGITATUM GmbH & Co. KG or, following the corporate reorganization in 2024, under the name AMTP GmbH & Co. KG.

6.2 Substantive Issues

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements is satisfied:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark 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.

It is further noted that the Panel has taken note of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)") and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views captured therein.

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 shown rights in respect of the widely known DFB trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the DFB mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name without any amendments or additions. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the DFB mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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.

In the present case, the issue of whether the Respondent has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name is disputed between the Parties. While the Respondent argues that it intends to use the disputed domain name in connection with training and promotional videos for a calibration of digital wheel

alignment technology, allegedly being developed under the designation “Dynamic Frame Balancing” (abbreviated as “DFB”), the Complainant refuses any such allegation as unfounded and “pure fantasy”.

In light of the Parties’ submissions, the Panel notes that the Respondent has so far not made any active use of the disputed domain name. The Panel further notes that, although the Respondent has submitted photographs of what appears to be a vehicle chassis frame surrounded by digital equipment, these photographs do not, in themselves, substantiate the Respondent’s assertion that the technology depicted is being developed under the designation “Dynamic Frame Balancing” and/or “DFB”.

Against this background, the Panel considers that the record contains circumstances which rather tend to support the Complainant’s position that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Nonetheless, the Panel does not consider it necessary to determine whether these circumstances are sufficient to establish or negate the Respondent’s rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, since, for the reasons set out below, the Complaint fails under the third element of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under the Policy, the Complainant bears the burden of proof that the Respondent both registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

As regards the registration of the disputed domain name in 2007, the Respondent has provided some explanation, supported by numerous documents, contemporaneous email correspondence and even recent statements from two individuals claiming to be involved at the relevant time, all of which indicating that the disputed domain name was registered in connection with a contemplated project involving the Complainant and intended to be used for a broadcasting platform to be operated by the Complainant. The Respondent further asserts that, after the project was ultimately abandoned, the disputed domain name was offered to the Complainant free of charge, but that offer was not taken up.

The Panel has certain reservations as to parts of the Respondent’s explanation of the historical circumstances surrounding the registration of the disputed domain name. However, the Panel does not find it necessary to determine whether the Respondent’s description of the events in 2007 is correct in every respect. The burden of proving bad faith registration remains with the Complainant. Based on the record, and taking into account both the contemporaneous and the recent documents relied upon by the Respondent, including email communications submitted by the Complainant itself, the Panel is not persuaded that the Complainant has established, on the balance of probabilities, that the disputed domain name was originally registered in bad faith. In particular, the email communication from the third party individual claiming to have been involved in the events surrounding the registration of the disputed domain name to the Complainant dated April 16, 2026, submitted by the Complainant itself, at least suggests that the registration of the disputed domain name in 2007 took place in the context of a potential collaboration between the Parties. Despite these indications in the email correspondence submitted by the Complainant, the Complaint itself contains only limited submissions regarding the issue of bad faith registration. Particularly, the Complaint does not specifically address the assertion that the registration of the disputed domain name in 2007 took place in the context of discussions concerning a potential collaboration between the Parties, nor does it expressly deny that such discussions took place.

In light of the above, the Panel also considered whether the relevant point in time for assessing bad faith registration could instead be the reorganization of the Respondent by its current owner in 2024. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.9. However, the Complainant itself acknowledges that the disputed domain name has at all relevant times remained registered in the name of the same legal entity, notwithstanding the subsequent change of its corporate name, registered seat and ownership. Consequently, on the particular facts of the present case, the Panel does not find that the company name change or the reorganization of the Respondent in 2024, without any formal transfer of the disputed domain name to a different person or legal entity, constitutes a new registration or acquisition of the disputed domain name for purposes of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel considers the circumstances surrounding the registration of the disputed domain name in 2007 to be the relevant point in time for assessing bad faith registration in the present case.

Since the Complainant has failed to establish that the disputed domain name was in 2007 registered in bad faith, the Complaint fails under the third element of the Policy. In light of this finding, the Panel does not consider it necessary to address whether the disputed domain name has also been used in bad faith.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has not been established.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Kaya Köklü /

Kaya Köklü

Sole Panelist

Date: July 30, 2026