

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Boehringer Ingelheim Animal Health France v. 何杨 (he yang)
Case No. D2025-4213

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Boehringer Ingelheim Animal Health France, France, represented by Nameshield, France.

The Respondent is 何杨 (he yang), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <frontlinepets-us.shop> is registered with Alibaba Cloud Computing Ltd. d/b/a HiChina (www.net.cn) (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 14, 2025. On October 14, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 15, 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 (NOT IDENTIFIED) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 15, 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 amended Complaint in English on October 15, 2025.

On October 15, 2025, the Center informed the parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On October 15, 2025, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission.

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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on October 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 11, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on November 12, 2025.

The Center appointed Qiang Ma as the sole panelist in this matter on November 21, 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 Complainant is a global leader in the animal health industry, with over 9,500 employees and a presence in more than 150 markets worldwide. The Complainant is one of the world's largest providers of animal vaccines, parasiticides, and therapeutics, supported by diagnostics and monitoring platforms.

FRONTLINE is a product used for the treatment and prevention of fleas, ticks, and chewing lice in dogs and cats, and it also aids in the control of sarcoptic mange in dogs.

The Complainant owns a portfolio of FRONTLINE trademark registrations, including but not limited to the International Trademark FRONTLINE, registered on June 9, 1994, and designated for International Class 5 (International Registration No. 621912, covering countries including China), as well as the International Trademark FRONTLINE, registered on January 30, 2015, and designated for International Classes 3 and 5 (International Registration No. 1245236, covering jurisdictions including the European Union, Singapore, Republic of Korea, Switzerland, among others).

In addition, the Complainant has held the domain name <frontline.com> since January 28, 1999.

The Respondent is 何杨 (he yang), based in China.

The disputed domain name <frontlinepets-us.shop> was registered on October 9, 2025 and currently resolves to a Shopify error page.

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 disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its FRONTLINE trademarks, which are fully incorporated therein. The addition of the generic term "pets," a term directly related to the Complainant's business and products, does not diminish the overall impression of similarity.

Furthermore, the Respondent is not listed in the Whois database under the disputed domain name, indicating that the Respondent is not commonly known by it. In addition, the parties are not affiliated, and the Complainant has never authorized the Respondent in any manner. Therefore, the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. This is further corroborated by the fact that the disputed domain name currently resolves to a Shopify error page and remains unused.

Finally, given that the Complainant's FRONTLINE trademarks were registered years ago and have acquired a substantial reputation, the Respondent must have been aware of the mark at the time of registering the disputed domain name and intentionally sought to capitalize on the Complainant's goodwill to attract Internet users searching for the Complainant's products.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons. Firstly, English is the predominant language in international communications and is one of the working languages of the Center. Secondly, the disputed domain name consists of Roman characters. Finally, requiring the proceedings to be conducted in Chinese would impose a substantial burden on the Complainant and cause unnecessary costs.

The Respondent did not make any specific submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2 Substantive Issues

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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

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

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here, "pets-us" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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 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 3.0](#), 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.

Firstly, the Respondent does not appear to be commonly known by the disputed domain name or any similar name. The Respondent has not acquired or applied for any trademark rights in “Frontlinepets” or “Frontlinepets-us.” Moreover, the Respondent’s name does not resemble the disputed domain name, and the Complainant has never authorized or permitted the Respondent to register the disputed domain name. Therefore, it can reasonably be concluded that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. Specifically, the term “pets” directly pertains to the Complainant’s core business of animal healthcare, and the element “us” is commonly understood to refer to the United States of America, which may falsely suggest to consumers that the website is the Complainant’s official United States of America platform. Therefore, the Panel considers that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Secondly, the Respondent does not appear to be making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or tarnish the Complainant’s trademarks. In this case, the disputed domain name resolves only to a Shopify error page and contains no substantive content. It is evident that the Respondent has not demonstrated any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Finally, the Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services. As evidenced by the Complainant, the Respondent is neither affiliated nor authorized by the Complainant in any capacity, and the Complainant neither conducts activities with nor maintains any business relationship with the Respondent. Consequently, the Respondent is not permitted to use the Complainant’s FRONTLINE trademarks in any manner. Furthermore, the Respondent is not currently operating the website associated with the disputed domain name, leaving it to display an error page, which further indicates the absence of any business plan for its use. Accordingly, the Respondent has made no bona fide offering of goods or services and lacks any legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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 intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks. Specifically, the Complainant's FRONTLINE trademarks are distinctive and have been registered for over a decade. The Complainant has used the trademarks in commerce, including through its official website, and operates the domain name <frontline.com> to promote and sell products under said trademarks. In light of these facts, the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name, which fully incorporates the Complainant's trademarks with the addition of the descriptive term "pets-us," constitutes clear evidence of bad faith in registration.

Moreover, the Panel has found that the non-use of a domain name, in the present case, resolution to an error 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 distinctiveness or 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 in use 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 <frontlinepets-us.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Qiang Ma/

Qiang Ma

Sole Panelist

Date: December 1, 2025