

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Liebherr-International AG v. Blessed Blessing
Case No. D2026-0125

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Liebherr-International AG, Switzerland, represented by Bettinger Rechtsanwälte, Germany.

The Respondent is Blessed Blessing, Greece.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 13, 2026. On January 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On January 13, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 19, 2026, 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 January 26, 2026.

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 January 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 15, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Nicholas Smith as the sole panelist in this matter on February 23, 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 part of a multinational group of companies, founded in 1949 and headquartered in Switzerland and Germany. The Complainant employs over 50,000 people and operates in 140 countries specializing in the manufacturing of construction machinery and also operates in other sectors such as mining equipment, aerospace and transportation systems. The Complainant offers its goods under the LIEBHERR name and maintains its official website at “www.liebherr.com”.

The Complainant has held trademark registrations for LIEBHERR (the “LIEBHERR Mark”) since at least 2003, including international registration number 860617, registered April 26, 2005 and designating various jurisdictions including Türkiye, Romania and the Russian Federation, for goods in classes 7, 9, 11 and 12.

The Domain Name was registered on December 23, 2025. The Domain Name resolves to a website maintained by the Registrar displaying pay-per-click (“PPC”) links. The Complaint contains evidence that the Respondent has sent a series of emails from the email account in the address format “[...]@liebherr.com” where the Respondent impersonates the Complainant and contacts third parties for illegitimate purposes, specifically seeking to direct payments intended for the Complainant into a third party account.

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 Domain Name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

- a) It is the owner of the LIEBHERR Mark, having registered the LIEBHERR Mark as an international trademark designating various jurisdictions. The Domain Name is confusingly similar to the LIEBHERR Mark as it reproduces the LIEBHERR Mark in its entirety, only adding the letter “l” as the third letter of the Domain Name to create a minor misspelling.
- b) There are no rights or legitimate interests held by the Respondent in respect of the Domain Name. The Complainant has not granted any license or authorization for the Respondent to use the LIEBHERR Mark. The Respondent is not commonly known by the LIEBHERR Mark, nor does it use the Domain Name for a bona fide purpose or legitimate noncommercial purpose. Rather, the Domain Name is used for emails impersonating the Complainant, which does not provide the Respondent with rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.
- c) The Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Domain Name is being used for emails that impersonate the Complainant in order to perpetuate fraud.

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 Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the Domain Name. Accordingly, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. Furthermore, a domain name which consists of a misspelling of a trademark is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for the purpose of the first element. Here the addition of the letter "l" to the otherwise wholly incorporated mark creates a minor misspelling of the Complainant's trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

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 that 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 3.1](#), 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 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 Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel considers that the record of this case reflects that:

- Before any notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the Respondent did not use, nor has it made demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.2.
- The Respondent (as an individual, business, or other organization) has not been commonly known by the Domain Name. Paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.3.
- The Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue. Paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.4.
- The record contains no other factors demonstrating rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the Domain Name.

The Respondent's use of the Domain Name is in connection with a scheme where it sends emails passing itself off as the Complainant to third parties, seeking to redirect payments from third parties to its account. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here claimed to be phishing, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here claimed to be phishing and impersonation/passing off) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the Domain Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy. The Domain Name has been used to create an email account where the Respondent sends emails purporting to be emails from the Complainant in order to commit a fraud on third parties. The current hosting of sponsored PPC links on the website at the Domain Name in the circumstances of this case further reinforces the notion that there was no good faith explanation for the registration and use of the Domain Name.

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 Domain Name <lilebherr.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nicholas Smith/

Nicholas Smith

Sole Panelist

Date: February 27, 2026