

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Continental Reifen Deutschland GmbH v. LIN FREDERICK, CONTITECH INTERNATIONAL CORP.

Case No. D2025-5278

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Continental Reifen Deutschland GmbH, Germany, represented by Göhmann Rechtsanwälte Abogados Advokat Steuerberater Partnerschaft mbB, Germany.

The Respondent is LIN FREDERICK, CONTITECH INTERNATIONAL CORP., China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <contitech.com> is registered with Network Solutions, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on December 17, 2025. On December 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 17, 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 (Network Solutions LLC/Perfect Privacy LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 18, 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 amendment to the Complaint on December 19, 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on January 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev 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 a member of the Continental Group, which develops pioneering technologies and services for mobility of people and goods. One of the principal divisions of the Continental Group is Contitech, which specializes in high-performance rubber, plastic and smart materials with a wide range of industrial applications. In 1999, the Contitech division generated a turnover of EUR 1.7 billion.

The Complainant is the owner of a number of trademark registrations for CONTITECH (the “CONTITECH trademark”), including the following representative registrations:

- the International trademark CONTITECH with registration No. 561480, registered on March 15, 1990 for goods and services in International Classes 1, 6, 7, 9, 12, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 35, 37 and 42; and
- the Chinese trademark CONTITECH with registration No. 796623, registered on December 7, 1995 for goods in International Class 12.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 19, 1999. It is currently inactive.

The case file contains no information about the Respondent other than its name and location as disclosed by the Registrar.

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 states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its CONTITECH trademark, because it consists solely of the identical word element “contitech”.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, because it has not used it in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant submits that when the disputed domain name was registered in 1999, the CONTITECH trademark had already gained considerable international recognition and was a central component of the Complainant's global market presence.

According to the Complainant, the CONTITECH trademark has become to be exclusively associated with the Complainant worldwide, so the Respondent must have been aware of this when registering the disputed domain name. The Complainant points out that the Respondent does not carry out any legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, and does not seem to have any intention to use it in the future.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to it, there is a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark with regard to the origin or affiliation of the disputed domain name, and the Respondent deliberately attempts to confuse Internet users into thinking that no website at the disputed domain name exists. The Complainant also submits that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in order to prevent the Complainant from reflecting its CONTITECH trademark in a corresponding domain name in the “.com” top-level domain.

The Complainant adds that it has made several commercial offers to the Respondent but received no response.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 the CONTITECH trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the CONTITECH trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the CONTITECH trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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. It has not provided evidence that a company under the name CONTITECH INTERNATIONAL CORP. actually exists. This could not be verified either by the Panel's independent research¹.

¹ Noting the general powers of a panel articulated *inter alia* in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the UDRP Rules, panels may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if they would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.8

The distinctive CONTITECH trademark was registered in 1990, and the Complainant has provided evidence that it was extensively used in 1999, when the disputed domain name was registered. The disputed domain name is identical to this trademark, which carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. Section 2.5.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#). The Respondent has not provided any explanation why it has registered the disputed domain name and how it intends to use it, despite having received the Written Notice delivered to it by courier service.

Considering the above, the Panel accepts as more likely than not that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name targeting the CONTITECH trademark of the Complainant in an attempt to receive some commercial advantage from the trademark's goodwill. Such conduct cannot give rise to rights of legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel therefore 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.

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 non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" 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 and reputation of the Complainant's CONTITECH trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, which identically reproduces the same trademark without any other elements and carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant, the failure of the Respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use 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 under the Policy.

The Panel therefore 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 <contitech.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Assen Alexiev/
Assen Alexiev
Sole Panelist
Date: January 26, 2026