

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Tüv Nord AG v. Ammar Khan

Case No. D2025-4484

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Tüv Nord AG, Germany, represented internally.

The Respondent is Ammar Khan, Times United Verifications and Inspections, Saudi Arabia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <tuvinsp.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 30, 2025. On October 30, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 30, 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 (Times United Verifications and Inspections) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 31, 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 on October 31, 2025.

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 November 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 30, 2025. The response due was extended until December 4, 2025 per the Respondent’s request on November 30, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on December 4, 2025.

The Center appointed Steven A. Maier as the sole panelist in this matter on December 12, 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 provides independent testing and verification services. It was founded in the 1860s by an association of German steam engine and boiler owners, and currently operates a network of six TÜV branded companies in Germany and Austria.

The Complainant is the owner of various trademarks comprising or including the term TÜV, including for example:

- Germany trademark registration number 1005638 for the word mark TÜV, registered on July 28, 1980 in International Class 42;

- Saudi Arabia trademark registration number 142107805 for the word mark TÜV, registered on June 22, 2003 in International Class 41; and

- European Union trademark registration number 005825781 for the word mark TÜV, registered on June 19, 2008 in numerous International Classes.

The Complainant does not provide details of any online presence, but appears to operate a website at “www.tuv-nord.com”.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 26, 2023.

The disputed domain name has resolved to a website at “www.tuvinsp.com”, headed “Times United”, and offering third-party inspection, testing and certification services in Saudi Arabia.

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.

The Complainant asserts that it is a world-famous provider of technical and verification services, enjoying a high level of recognition, goodwill, and fame owing to substantial investment and the widespread success of its business under the TÜV mark. The Complainant does not provide any financial information, but exhibits a 47-page report dated April 2024 which concludes that 97% of the population of Germany has active knowledge of the TÜV brand.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its TÜV trademark, differing from that trademark only by the omission of the umlaut over the letter “u” and the inclusion of the term “insp”, which is an abbreviation of the descriptive word “inspection”.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. It states that the Respondent trades as “Times United” and does not have any trademark, company name or imprint that includes the letter “v”. It submits that, while “TU” might be a valid acronym for the Respondent’s name, “TUV” is not, and that the Respondent is using that acronym only to evoke an association with the Complainant’s TÜV trademark. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has not

commonly been known by the disputed domain name, and is using it only for commercial gain, by providing similar services to the Complainant with an intent to exploit the Complainant's trademark rights.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It reiterates that the six TÜV companies and TÜV trademark are world famous, and contends that the trademark was registered long before the disputed domain name. It states that the disputed domain name is causing harm to the Complainant and disrupting its activities, and asserts that the Respondent intentionally chose the disputed domain name to fake an association with the Complainant and the well-known TÜV brand.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent submits that it operates a lawfully registered and fully licensed Saudi Arabian business, providing inspection, certification, and training services. It states that it registered the disputed domain name to represent "Times United Verifications and Inspections", and that it has used the disputed domain name to facilitate its internal operations, as opposed to using it for any external purpose that could be confused with the Complainant's branding.

The Respondent disputes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's TÜV trademark, and submits that the disputed domain name creates a different overall impression without any likelihood of confusion.

The Respondent submits that it has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name by virtue of its business activities. It exhibits various documents in support of the legitimate nature of its operation, including a commercial registration certificate, a quotation, a tax invoice, a cash receipt, an inspection certificate apparently issued to a third party, a training certificate, and other similar documentation.

The Respondent denies having registered the disputed domain name in bad faith. It states that it was not aware of the Complainant's business or trademark when it registered the disputed domain name. It submits that it has never used the term "TUV" as a brand or in a public-facing manner and that the disputed domain name is a technical identifier of its services. It states that it would have no reason to pass itself off as the Complainant and has not done so, with its identity as "Times United" being clear from its website and operations. It adds that it has never approached the Complainant's customers, never used trade styling that could be confused with the Complainant's, and never offered the disputed domain name for sale. It further submits that the Complainant has failed to produce any evidence of actual customer confusion.

Without prejudice to its Response, the Respondent indicates a willingness to enter into settlement terms with the Complainant involving a transition period. It makes no mention of any financial terms.

The Panel notes that the Response does not follow the model Response form provided by the Center, and therefore lacks the certification as to authenticity; the Panel is prepared however to accept the Respondent's submissions as bona fide given their tone and content as described above.

The Respondent requests the dismissal of the Complaint.

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

The Complainant has established that it is the owner of registered trademark rights in the mark TÜV. The disputed domain name contains the letters "tuv" together with the further letters "insp", which both Parties appear to agree represents an abbreviation of the dictionary word "inspection". While the term "tuv" in the disputed domain name omits the umlaut found in the Complainant's trademark, the Panel finds nonetheless that the Complainant's trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, which is sufficient for the threshold purposes of the first element.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Respondent appears to use the disputed domain name to promote an active business under the name "Times United", providing testing, inspection and certification services in Saudi Arabia. The Panel finds that the disputed domain name represents a credible choice of domain name to represent the verification and inspection services offered by that business – i.e., using "tuv" to indicate "Times", "United" and "Verification", and "insp" to indicate "inspection". In those circumstances, to rebut the appearance of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, the Complainant must show that the Respondent's business and/or website do not represent a bona fide business venture, but are instead a sham or pretext for the bad-faith use of the disputed domain name to target the Complainant's trademark. It is important to note in this regard that the UDRP is not a mechanism for the resolution of trademark disputes between respective business owners, and that, providing the Respondent's business is not a sham or pretext as identified above, allegations that the Respondent may be infringing the Complainant's trademark are insufficient in themselves to meet the requirements of the Policy.

The Panel does not find in this case that the Respondent's business and/or website represent a sham or pretext aimed primarily at bad-faith exploitation of the Complainant's trademark rights. The Respondent has produced substantial evidence of its trading activities, and the Panel does not consider its website to bear the hallmarks of a deceptive site. There are, however, two matters which the Panel has considered worthy of further examination. The first of these relates to the Respondent's mailing address as notified to the Registrar, which consists of a residential address in Leeds, United Kingdom, although claiming to be an address in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. This confusion is exacerbated by the fact that the Respondent does not appear to disclose a full mailing address on its website or in the documentation which it has exhibited, but only a Riyadh postcode area.

The second matter which the Panel considered notable was that the majority of the material exhibited by the Respondent consisted of self-generated business documents, e.g., invoices, reports and certificates, as opposed to material concerning the Respondent emanating from third parties, or press or media coverage referring to the Respondent's activities.

In view of these matters, the Panel has conducted limited factual research concerning the Respondent from publicly available resources, as contemplated by section 4.8 of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#). In particular, the Panel has sought third-party verification of the ISO certification claimed by the Respondent, by interrogating the

International Accreditation Forum database at “www.iafcertsearch.org”. This confirmed the existence of two certificates issued by Intercert, Inc. in the name of “TIMES UNITED VERIFICATIONS AND INSPECTIONS”. The search results also disclosed a full mailing address for the Respondent within the Riyadh, Saudi Arabia postcode area provided by the Respondent.

In the circumstances, while the UDRP does not provide a forum for an exhaustive factual enquiry as might be available in a court of law, the Complainant has failed to satisfy the Panel, on the balance of probabilities, that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name for its apparent business purposes is in fact a sham or pretext.

The second element under the Policy is not therefore established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

While the Panel’s findings in respect of the second element, above, are sufficient to dispose of the proceeding, the Panel will also comment briefly to say that given the apparently genuine nature of the Respondent’s business, and notwithstanding the survey provided by the Complainant, insofar as the Complainant may take objection to the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name for the purpose of its website, such objection would appear to implicate a legal dispute outside the confines of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Steven A. Maier/

Steven A. Maier

Sole Panelist

Date: December 30, 2025