

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Rödl Equity Partner Beteiligung GmbH & Co. KG, Prof. Dr. Christian Rödl, LL.M. (Columbia University, New York) v. Paulson LLC, Paul Sandip
Case No. D2025-5018

1. The Parties

Complainants are Rödl Equity Partner Beteiligung GmbH & Co. KG, and Prof. Dr. Christian Rödl, LL.M. (Columbia University, New York), Germany, represented by Rödl Rechtsanwaltsgesellschaft Steuerberatungsgesellschaft mbH, Germany.

Respondent is Paulson LLC, Paul Sandip, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 3, 2025. On December 3, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 3, 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 (unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainants on December 9, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainants filed an amendment to the Complaint on December 12, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 12, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 1, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on January 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Gabriel F. Leonardos as the sole panelist in this matter on January 8, 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

Complainants are responsible for a large auditing and consulting firm that has provided legal, tax, financial and IT consulting for more than 50 years. The firm is headquartered in Nuremberg, Germany and has more than 110 offices in 50 countries.

As shown in the examples below, Complainants own several trademark registrations for RÖDL and ROEDL, as well as domain names such as <roedl.com>; <roedl.de>; <roedl-global.com>; and <roedl-international.com>.

Registration Number	Trademark	Jurisdiction	International Class	Registration Date
30679518	RÖDL	Germany	35, 36, 41, 42, 45	May 29, 2007
006026281	RÖDL	European Union	35, 36, 45	April 23, 2008
302014041341	ROEDL	Germany	35, 36, 45	May 16, 2014

The disputed domain name <roedlgroup.com> was created on October 28, 2025. The disputed domain name resolves to a parking page with links related to advertisements for law firms and accountants.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainants

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

Notably, Complainants contend that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademarks. According to Complainants, the key element of the disputed domain name is ROEDL, and the added term "group" is descriptive and does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Complainants affirm that the letter "ö" was not registerable as part of a ".com" domain name until the IDN standard was adopted and "oe" was and still is used in substitution. In this sense, the disputed domain name would be confusingly similar to Complainants' trademarks RÖDL, ROEDL, RODL & PARTNER, RÖDL & PARTNER and ROEDL & PARTNER.

Therefore, Complainants contend the disputed domain name is confusingly similar with Complainants' trademarks, fulfilling paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

According to Complainants, Respondent is not licensed nor authorized to register or use the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the use of the website as a domain parking program could not be considered as a bona fide offering of goods or services.

In this manner, Complainants state that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, fulfilling paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

Finally, Complainants urge that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to Complainants, Respondent uses the disputed domain name as a pay-per-click program and the content appearing on the website, such as the advertisements of tax related services, associates the disputed domain name to Complainants' marks and services. In this sense, the disputed domain name was

registered in an attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainants' trademarks.

Thus, according to Complainants, the requirements for the identification of a bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name have been fulfilled, pursuant to paragraphs 4(a)(iii) and 4(b) of the Policy. Accordingly, Complainants request that the disputed domain name <roedlgroup.com> be transferred to Complainant Rödl Equity Partner Beteiligung GmbH & Co. KG.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainants' contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed in a UDRP complaint, Complainants must demonstrate that all the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, as following:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainants have rights; and
- (ii) 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 burden of proving these elements is upon Complainants.

Respondent had 20 days to submit a response in accordance with paragraph 5(a) of the Rules and failed to do so. Paragraph 5(f) of the Rules establishes that if a respondent does not respond to the Complaint, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel's decision shall be based upon the Complaint.

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 Complainants' 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.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 entirety of the trademark ROEDL is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of the term "group" may bear assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of such term 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.

Therefore, based on the available record, 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 Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on Complainants, 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 Complainants make out a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on Complainants). If Respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, Complainants are deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds Complainants have established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

Although parking pages are permissible in some circumstances, panels have held that a parking page does not confer rights or legitimate interests when the domain name is registered with the use of a registered trademark. In this sense, see *Blue Apron, LLC v. Tulip Trading Company*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-1035](#).

Based on the available record, Respondent is not entitled to any trademark, trade name, or any other right associated with the disputed domain name. Additionally, Respondent has not been authorized by Complainants to use the RÖDL and ROEDL trademarks, is not recognized by the disputed domain name, and there is no commercial relationship between the Parties. The Panel finds that the use of the disputed domain name to host a parked page comprising pay-per-click links does not represent a bona fide offering as the links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant’s mark.

In light of these circumstances, the Panel finds that no rights or legitimate interests can be found on behalf of Respondent.

Accordingly, 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 Respondent has registered the disputed domain name that is confusingly similar to Complainants’ trademarks RÖDL and ROEDL. Also, based on the available record, it was established that Respondent has no affiliation with Complainants and its trademarks, nor has it sought authorization or a license to utilize the referred trademarks. Also, Respondent does not own any trademarks containing the term or showed any rights over the trademarks or any related terms.

Respondent evidently knew or should have known of the existence of Complainants’ prior trademark rights and domain names, which were matters of public record, before registering the disputed domain name. The registration of the disputed domain name was carried out by Respondent, who had the responsibility to verify the existence of the referred trademarks.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for a pay-per-click service or to take any kind of unfair advantage of the reputation of the trademark owner is sufficient for a finding of bad faith in the registration of the disputed domain name. In this sense, see *Associazione Radio Maria v. Mary Martinez / Domains by Proxy, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-2181](#).

Therefore, the Panel finds that the circumstances of the present case allow for a finding of bad faith in the registration and use of the disputed domain name, since Respondent intended to financially profit by attracting users to its website through the use of a confusingly similar domain name and the reproduction of Complainants' marks.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that 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 <roedlgroup.com> be transferred to Complainant Rödl Equity Partner Beteiligung GmbH & Co. KG.

/Gabriel F. Leonardos/

Gabriel F. Leonardos

Sole Panelist

Date: January 22, 2026