

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Müller & Meirer, Lederwarenfabrik, GmbH v. wang lanlan
Case No. D2025-4928

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Müller & Meirer, Lederwarenfabrik, GmbH, Germany, represented by CMS Hasche Sigle Partnerschaft von Rechtsanwälten und Steuerberatern mbB, Germany.

The Respondent is wang lanlan, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <breetaschen.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on November 26, 2025. On November 26, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 27, 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 (Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 27, 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 November 27, 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 December 9, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 29, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on January 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Johan Sjöbeck as the sole panelist in this matter on January 19, 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 in the business of marketing and selling bags and accessories. The Complainant has submitted evidence that it is the owner of a number of BREE trademark registrations, including:

BREE (figurative), German Trademark Registration No. 30117882 with filing date March 17, 2001 and registration date December 4, 2001, for classes 9, 16, 18 and 25;

BREE, European Union (“EU”) Trademark Registration No. 006578355 with filing date January 15, 2008 and registration date November 2, 2011, for classes 9, 16, 18 and 25;

BREE (figurative), EU Trademark Registration No. 006578439 with filing date January 15, 2008 and registration date October 19, 2012 for classes 9, 16, 18 and 25; and

BREE (figurative), EU Trademark Registration No. 18157320 with filing date November 25, 2019 and registration date June 3, 2020 for classes 9, 18, 25 and 35.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 23, 2025. The disputed domain name resolves to a website with a header “Bree® Taschen, Rucksack, Handtaschen Deutschland Offizielle Website” (in English “Bree® Bags, Backpacks, and Handbags – Germany Official Website”) that offers for sale handbags bearing the Complainant’s trademark.

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 <breetaschen.com>.

The Complainant acquired the rights to the trademark BREE when Bree Collection GmbH became insolvent in January 2024. The trademark is iconic and famous in the EU, and particularly in Germany, for bags, suitcases and related products. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark. The disputed domain name includes the trademark with the addition of the descriptive term “taschen”, which is “bags” in German. Where a trademark is recognizable within a disputed domain name, the addition of descriptive terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element according to section 1.7 of WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”).

The Complainant’s use and adoption of the trademark predate the Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has no legitimate interests or rights to the disputed domain name. The Respondent neither has a connection or affiliation with the Complainant and has not been granted any form of permission to use the trademark in domain names or else. The Respondent has not used the disputed domain name for any legitimate purpose, including a bona fide offering of goods or services. There is no indication whatsoever that the Respondent is commonly known under the disputed domain name or has been making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of it without intent for commercial gain, to mislead consumers, or to tarnish the Complainant’s trademark. By contrast, the Respondent has used the disputed domain name for illegal activities.

The composition of the disputed domain name with the trademark and the addition of “bags”, for which the Complainant is well known, carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. Furthermore, it is well established that use of a domain name for claimed impersonation of the Complainant can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent, see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name have been done in bad faith. There are circumstances indicating that the respondent registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; and circumstances indicating that the respondent is using the disputed domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the respondent's website or location or of a product or service on its website or location. The Respondent's website contains multiple references to Bree GmbH and is created in a way to suggest that it originates from the owner of the trademarks. The company Bree GmbH merged with BREE Collection GmbH in 2015.

Given the content of the Respondent's website and the widespread recognition of the Complainant's trademark in Germany, it is inconceivable for the Respondent to be unaware of the trademark at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name in order to exploit and profit from the Complainant's rights in the trademark through the creation of Internet user confusion. Considering the overall look and feel of the Respondent's website, the prominent display of the Complainant's logo and trademark, Internet users easily could be confused into believing that the Respondent's website is affiliated with or have the endorsement or sponsorship of the Complainant, or that the goods advertised on this website are in fact genuine BREE-branded goods. The Respondent is attempting to pass itself off as the Complainant.

Considering the above, the Respondent's conduct constitutes bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. It is clear from the relevant circumstances that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant and had the Complainant's trademark in mind when registering the disputed domain name. The Respondent's primary motive in relation to the registration and use of the disputed domain name was to capitalize on or otherwise take advantage of the Complainant's trademark rights, through the creation of Internet user confusion. In addition, the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, to intentionally attract Internet users to its websites for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks as to source, sponsorship or affiliation.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in 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

The test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

From the submitted evidence it is clear that the Complainant is the owner of the registered trademark BREE and the Panel concludes that the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy.

The disputed domain name <breettaschen.com> incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety with the addition of the German term "taschen", which translates to "bags". The Panel finds that the trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name and that the addition of the term to the trademark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Having the above in mind, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark and that the Complainant has proven the first requirement of the Policy under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant must show that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name. The Respondent may establish rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name by demonstrating in accordance with paragraph 4(c) of the Policy any of the following:

- (i) the Respondent uses or has made preparations to use the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services prior to the dispute; or
- (ii) the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, even if the Respondent has not acquired any trademark rights; or
- (iii) the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark.

The Complainant's trademark registration predates the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not licensed, approved or in any way consented to the Respondent's registration and use of the trademark in the disputed domain name.

There is no evidence in the case file indicating that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. On the contrary, the evidence shows that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name for a commercial website that deliberately creates a false impression that it is operated by, affiliated with, or endorsed by the trademark owner. The evidence indicates that the Respondent is seeking to pass itself off as the Complainant and to trade on the goodwill of the Complainant's trademark, as its website contains direct references to the Complainant while indicating that it is an "official" website, and reproduces the Complainant's trademark on both the website and the products offered for sale. Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. Additionally, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name, adding the descriptive term "taschen" to the Complainants' trademark, coupled with the use of the disputed domain name to resolve to a website in which the Respondent tries to impersonate the Complainant, affirms the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website.

In the absence of any Response, the Respondent has failed to rebut the Complainant's *prima facie* case and to bring forward any circumstances demonstrating, pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Thus, in the absence of any contrary evidence, the Panel finds that the Complainant has also established the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy, evidence of bad faith registration and use include without limitation:

- (i) circumstances indicating the disputed domain name was registered or acquired primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the disputed domain name registration to the owner of a trademark or to a competitor of the trademark owner, for valuable consideration in excess of the documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name; or
- (ii) circumstances indicating that the disputed domain name was registered in order to prevent the owner of a trademark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided there is a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) circumstances indicating that the disputed domain name was registered primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) circumstances indicating that the disputed domain name has intentionally been used in an attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or location or of a product or service on that website or location.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety together with the descriptive term "taschen", meaning "bags" in German, a term directly related to the Complainant's products, making it implausible that the Respondent selected the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant, its trademark, or its business. This is reinforced by the fact that the disputed domain name is used to market the same type of products for which the Complainant's trademark is registered, and by the Respondent's reproduction of the trademark on its website and on the products offered for sale. Internet users and consumers are misled into believing that the website is owned by, affiliated with, or otherwise associated with the Complainant.

Accordingly, in the absence of any contrary evidence, the Panel is persuaded, on the balance of probabilities, that the disputed domain name has been intentionally used to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the products offered thereon, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Another factor to weigh in the balance is the fact that the Respondent has not responded to the Complainant's contentions.

Hence, there is no evidence in this case that refutes the Complainant's submissions, and the Panel concludes that the Complainant has proved the requirements under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy that the disputed domain name has been registered and used in bad faith.

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 <breetaschen.com> shall be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Johan Sjöbeck/
Johan Sjöbeck
Sole Panelist
Date: February 2, 2026*