

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

The Procter & Gamble Company and Braun GmbH v. Haas Tash
Case No. D2025-2866

1. The Parties

The Complainants are The Procter & Gamble Company, United States of America, and Braun GmbH, Germany, represented by Studio Barbero S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is Haas Tash, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <us-braun.shop> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 18, 2025. On July 21, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 21, 2025, 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 (Domain Administrator, See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 23, 2025, 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 July 28, 2025.

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 July 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 19, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 21, 2025.

The Center appointed Ada L. Redondo Aguilera as the sole panelist in this matter on August 28, 2025. 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 Complainants in the present proceeding are The Procter & Gamble Company and Braun GmbH.

The “First Complainant” is The Procter & Gamble Company, founded in 1837 by William Procter and James Gamble, which began as a family run candle and soap business, which eventually grew into one of the largest and most profitable consumer goods companies in the world. The products were initially produced and commercialized in Cincinnati, United States of America. Over time, the First Complainant’s business expanded globally.

Numerous new products and trademarks were introduced over time. The First Complainant initiated a strategic expansion into new markets, acquiring other companies that diversified their product line. In 2005, the First Complainant announced the acquisition of the Gillette Company. This operation added, besides GILLETTE products, also BRAUN to the stable since the Gillette Company had become the owner of BRAUN trademark in 1984, after having already purchased a controlling interest in the Second Complainant back in 1967.

The “Second Complainant” is Braun GmbH founded in the year 1921 by Max Braun and originally was a small engineering shop in Frankfurt am Main, Germany. Max Braun’s first product was a transmission belt connector that substantially reduced wear on transmission belts, and, in 1929, he entered the radio industry, developing various items in said field. The Second Complainant further expanded its business in the 1950s by launching the first electronic razors and a Multimix kitchen blender, entering both the shaving and the kitchen household appliances segments. At the end of the 1960s, the BRAUN product portfolio included radios and phonographs, televisions, shavers as well as kitchen appliances, lighters, and photographic equipment and the acquisition of the controlling interest in the Second Complainant by the Gillette Company. The Second Complainant opened up new sales channels for BRAUN items in 145 countries.

The first Complainant is the mother company of The Second Complainant and the formal registrant of most of the domain names that include the BRAUN trademark. The Second Complainant is the owner of many of the trademark registrations for BRAUN (including the ones cited in the Complaint).

The Complainants are the owners of numerous trademarks registrations for BRAUN in several countries, including the following, all at present registered in the name of the Second Complainant:

- International Trademark Registration No. 652027 for BRAUN (word mark), registered on November 14, 1995, in Classes 11, 14, 16, 21, 26, 35, 37;
- International Trademark Registration No. 650428 for BRAUN (word mark), registered on November 14, 1995, in Classes 1, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11;
- International Trademark Registration No. 400415 for BRAUN (semi-figurative mark), registered on May 23, 1973, in Classes 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 21, 34;
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 000394122 for BRAUN (word mark), registered on August 17, 1999, in Classes 1, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 16, 21, 26, 35, 37.

The Complainants have registered many domain names that include the name BRAUN, including the domain name <braun.com> on June 24, 1997, in the name of the First Complainant and used for the Complainants' principal website dedicated to BRAUN.

The Respondent is Haas Tash.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 6, 2025. Before the filing of this Complaint, the disputed domain name initially resolved to a website employing the Complainant's BRAUN trademark and purporting to offer BRAUN products at discounted prices. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to an inactive error page. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to the same inactive error page.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainants contend that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its BRAUN trademark since it includes the Complainant's trademark in its entirety with the "us" letters and a hyphen. Also, the Complainants argue that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests concerning the disputed domain name, and finally, that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainants request the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Second Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Issue: Consolidation of the Complainants

The Complainants submitted a request for consolidation in this proceeding in their Complaint. Pursuant to the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 4.11.1, the consolidation of multiple complainants filing a joint complaint against one respondent is subject to the discretion of the appointed panel. In assessing whether a complaint filed by multiple complainants may be brought against one respondent, the appointed panel should consider whether (i) the complainants have a specific common grievance against the respondent, or the respondent has engaged in common conduct that has affected the complainants in a similar fashion; and (ii) it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to permit the consolidation. The Panel therefore submits that the consolidation of the Complainants would be appropriate in the present proceeding and would not have any unfair prejudicial effect on the Respondent. The Panel notes that the Complainants in this administrative proceeding are affiliated since The Second Complainant is a wholly owned subsidiary of The First Complainant. As such, the two entities have sufficient common legal interest in the BRAUN trademarks that are incorporated in the disputed domain name. Therefore, the Panel finds that it is fair and equitable under the circumstances of the case to permit consolidation as the Complainants are not only affiliated companies as parent and subsidiary but also have common interests, and therefore it is appropriate to have joint Complainants in this proceeding.

6.2. Substantive Matters

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainants prove the following three elements in order to prevail in this proceeding: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainants have rights; and (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and (iii) the disputed domain name was 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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainants have shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel notes that in the present case, the disputed domain name includes the Complainants' trademark BRAUN together with the letters "us", as a likely reference to the United States of America, and a hyphen. Although the addition of other terms, here "us-", may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such a "us-" letters and the hyphen does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the trademark for the purposes of the Policy. See the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Additionally, it is well established that the generic Top-Level Domain "gTLD" (in this case ".shop") is generally disregarded when considering whether a disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark in which the complainant has rights. Section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

The Panel finds that 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 a respondent's lack 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 with the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainants have established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainants' 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 asserted by the Complainants, the Panel notes that the Respondent does not appear to hold any trademark rights to use the BRAUN term. There is also no evidence that the Respondent retains unregistered trademark rights to the term BRAUN and there is also no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has been commonly known by the name “braun” or by the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that the Respondent has not received any license from the Complainants to use a domain name featuring the BRAUN trademark. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainants have 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. The disputed domain name combines the Complainants’ well-known trademark BRAUN with the geographic term “us”, that is inherently causing a direct confusion on the Internet users to a geographical place where the First Complainant has their main offices and operations. As held in section 2.5.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), “[e]ven where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term (at the second- or top-level), UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner”.

Furthermore, the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name cannot be considered legitimate noncommercial or fair use without intent for commercial gain, since the Respondent has attempted to gain from the sales of the purported BRAUN products featured on its website, and that the Respondent’s intention was to illegitimately trade on the Complainants’ fame for commercial gain.

The Panel notes that according with the evidence presented in the present case by the Complainants, the Respondent originally redirected the disputed domain name to a commercial website displaying the Complainants’ trademark BRAUN and offering for sale purported BRAUN products at discounted prices, without providing any disclaimer of non-affiliation with the Complainants. Such conduct clearly demonstrates that the Respondent did not intend to use the disputed domain name in connection with any legitimate purpose. The Respondent’s use cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or even a fair use without intent for commercial gain. See section 2.8.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

Currently, the disputed domain name is no longer active, therefore, the Panel notes that the fact that the disputed domain name currently resolves to an inactive website does not constitute a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, especially in the case of prior infringing use.

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 that establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation of, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

The Panel finds that the Complainants’ earliest BRAUN trademark registration predates the creation date of the disputed domain name. In addition, the Complainants have accrued substantial goodwill and recognition since the Complainants’ establishment in the market. The BRAUN trademark is particularly famous for its electric shavers, which were offered for sale at the disputed domain name. Moreover, it has been accepted in past decisions that the selection of a domain name that is so obviously connected to a complainant’s trademark strongly suggests “opportunistic bad faith” in the registration of the disputed domain name, particularly where it is held by someone with no affiliation with the complainant, see *Singapore Airlines Ltd v. European Travel Network*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0641](#) and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

Also, the Panel concludes that the Respondent chose to register the disputed domain name comprised of the Complainants' trademark combined with the term "us" and the hyphen to facilitate a scheme where the Respondent's website impersonated one of the Complainants and allegedly offered for sale products which purported to be those of the Complainants.

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 3.0](#), section 3.2.1. In the present case, the Panel finds the Respondent's bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name for the following reasons:

First, the use of the BRAUN trademark in the disputed domain name with the inclusion of the name of the country where the First Complainant is headquartered together with a hyphen suggests that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name with the actual knowledge of the Complainants and their trademarks, and has done so in an attempt to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainants.

Second, The Respondent didn't reply to the cease-and-desist letters sent by the Complainants on February 10, April 16, and June 30, 2025.

Third, the different uses of the disputed domain name. The Panel also finds that the different uses of the disputed domain name are bad faith uses. Prior to the presentation of the Complaint, the website in the disputed domain name previously displayed the Complainants' trademark and apparently offered for sale the Complainants products, which falls squarely into paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Regarding the use at the time of filing of the Complaint and the current use, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case, the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith, meeting the third condition of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainants have 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 <us-braun.shop> be transferred to the Second Complainant (Braun GmbH).

/Ada L. Redondo Aguilera/

Ada L. Redondo Aguilera

Sole Panelist

Date: September 11, 2025