ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Donner & Reuschel Aktiengesellschaft v. Evans Kerry
Case No. D2026-0552

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Donner & Reuschel Aktiengesellschaft, Germany, represented by SPIEKER & JAEGER PartG mbB, Germany.

The Respondent is Evans Kerry, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <donner-reuschel.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 February 10, 2026. On February 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 10, 2026, 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 the Complainant on February 11, 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 February 16, 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 February 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 11, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Tobias Zuberbühler as the sole panelist in this matter on March 17, 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 German private banking institution founded in 1798.

The Complainant owns various trademark registrations, including the international trademark DONNER & REUSCHEL (No. 1045178, registered on July 2, 2010). The Complainant's website can be accessed at "www.donner-reuschel.de".

The disputed domain name was registered on July 23, 2025, and resolves to a website identical to the Complainant's website, featuring the Complainant's logo and trademark. The website provides users with an option of logging into supposed bank accounts.

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.

B. Respondent

The Respondent has not submitted any 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 Select 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 Complainant's trademark is fully contained in the disputed domain name, the only slight difference being the replacement of the sign "&" in the Complainant's trademark by a hyphen in the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The Panel finds that 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 3.1, section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks any 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 evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise. The Panel also notes that the composition of the disputed domain name when considered together with its use as described above under section 4 may mislead Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name and its corresponding website are connected to the Complainant.

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.

Under the circumstances of this case, it can be inferred that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant’s trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the evidence and allegations submitted by the Complainant support a finding that the Respondent has attempted to attract Internet users to his website for his own commercial gain. The Respondent has therefore registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has also 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 <donner-reuschel.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Tobias Zuberbühler/
Tobias Zuberbühler
Sole Panelist
Date: March 30, 2026