

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

TALANX AG v. M Furqan Qureshi  
Case No. D2025-4954

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is TALANX AG, Germany, represented by Deloitte Legal Rechtsanwaltsgesellschaft mbH, Germany.

The Respondent is M Furqan Qureshi, India.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <tal anxgroup.com> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 27, 2025. On November 27, 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 (Redacted for Privacy Purposes, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 28, 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 December 1, 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 2, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 22, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 23, 2025.

The Center appointed Daniel Peña as the sole panelist in this matter on December 29, 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 stock corporation incorporated under the laws of Germany, headquartered in Hannover. It has operated worldwide under the invented name TALANX since 1998 and forms part of the Talanx Group, whose origins trace back to the insurance association HDI V.a.G., founded in 1903. Today, the Talanx Group is Germany's third-largest insurance group and one of Europe's major providers, active on five continents and in more than 175 countries.

The Complainant owns numerous registered trademarks for TALANX and TALANX GROUP, including but not limited to:

- German Trademark Registration TALANX (DE 39924539), registered July 15, 1999, class 36;
- European Union Trademark Registration TALANX (EUTM 3250966), registered November 24, 2004, classes 16, 35, 36;
- European Union Trademark Registration TALANX (EUTM 3208972), registered July 27, 2004, classes 16, 35, 36;
- European Union Trademark Registration TALANX GROUP (EUTM 9336967), registered January 7, 2011, classes 16, 35, 36;
- European Union Trademark Registration (EUTM 9355348), registered March 17, 2011, classes 35, 36, 37; and.
- International Trademark Registrations ("IR") based on European Union marks, extending protection to multiple jurisdictions including the United Kingdom, Switzerland, China, Türkiye, Bahrain, Ukraine, and the Russian Federation (e.g., IR 1487864, IR 1487911, IR 1558556, IR 1082421, IR 1487884, IR 1506066, IR 1506406, IR 1506068, IR 1506067, IR 1542833, IR 1506065).

The disputed domain name was registered on February 4, 2022. It redirects to the English-language website of the GoDaddy domain marketplace, where it is currently offered for sale for USD 2,995.

#### **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 identical to the Complainant's registered trademarks and highly similar to its other TALANX marks.

The Complainant considers that the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's marks, with the addition of the descriptive term "group" and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com", which does not

prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Consumers are likely to assume affiliation with the Complainant's well-known insurance group.

The Complainant asserts longstanding rights in TALANX and TALANX GROUP trademarks, predating the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent lacks authorization, has made no bona fide use of the disputed domain name, and registered it with knowledge of the Complainant's reputation. By combining the terms "talanx" with "group", the Respondent impersonates the Complainant's identity, suggesting false sponsorship. Thus, the Complainant establishes a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full awareness of the Complainant's famous marks, which are distinctive and globally recognized. The coined term "talanx" makes random registration implausible. The disputed domain name redirects to the GoDaddy marketplace, where it is offered for sale at the amount of USD 2,995, evidencing intent to profit from the Complainant's goodwill. Such conduct demonstrates bad faith, as the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name to trade on the reputation of the Complainant.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, for the transfer of the disputed domain name the Complainant must establish 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. The Rules provide that if the respondent does not comply with the time periods established, or with any provision or requirement under paragraph 14 of the Rules, the panel shall proceed to a decision on the complaint and draw such inferences as it considers appropriate. Pursuant to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, a panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable. The Panel has reviewed the case and found the following:

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy requires the Complainant to show that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant has provided evidence of its rights in the trademarks TALANX and TALANX GROUP based on multiple trademark registrations, including international and European Union registrations and a registration in Germany. The Panel finds that the Complainant has shown rights in respect of the trademarks for the purposes of the Policy (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 1.2.1).

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's TALANX and identical to the TALANX GROUP trademarks. The Respondent's incorporation of the Complainant's mark in full in the disputed domain name is evidence that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's marks. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. Although the inclusion of additional terms, such as the word "group" may be relevant to the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel considers that

such additions do not preclude a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the TALANX mark under the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Furthermore, the gTLD, “.com” is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1. The Panel is satisfied that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s TALANX mark and identical to the TALANX GROUP trademark and the Complainant has satisfied the first requirement of the Policy.

## **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.

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. Based on the information submitted by the Complainant, the Complainant has not granted the Respondent authorization to register or use the disputed domain name.

Moreover, there is no evidence indicating that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. Finally, the Respondent did not respond to the Complainant’s contentions.

The Panel finds that 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. 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.

Panels have found that the practice such as registering a domain name for subsequent resale (including for a profit) would not by itself support a claim that the respondent registered the domain name in bad faith. Circumstances indicating that a domain name was registered for the bad-faith purpose of selling it to a trademark owner can be highly fact specific; the nature of the domain name (e.g., whether a typo of a famous mark, a domain name wholly incorporating the relevant mark plus a geographic term or one related to the complainant’s area of commercial activity, or a pure dictionary term) and the distinctiveness of the trademark at issue, among other factors, are relevant to this inquiry. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.

In the present case, the Panel considers (i) that the disputed domain name has been redirected to a website of the GoDaddy-domain-marketplace, where the disputed domain name was (and is still) offered for sale, which, in the circumstances of this case, reflects an intent to capitalize on the Complainant's reputation; (ii) the distinctiveness of the TALANX and TALANX GROUP trademarks as well as the composition of the disputed domain name, including entirely the Complainant's trademarks; (iii) as well as the Respondent's failure to submit a response to the Complaint; (iv) and the implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith 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 <tal anxgroup.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Daniel Peña/*

**Daniel Peña**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 12, 2026