

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Brose Fahrzeugteile SE & Co KG, Coburg v. mohamed baghdadi, mohae
Case No. D2026-0628

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Brose Fahrzeugteile SE & Co KG, Coburg, Germany, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is mohamed baghdadi, mohae, Algeria.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <brose.group> is registered with Mesh Digital Limited (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 13, 2026. On February 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 13, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC DomainsByProxy.com) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 16, 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 17, 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 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Harini Narayanswamy as the sole panelist in this matter on March 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 family-owned German company founded in 1908 and is headquartered in Coburg, Germany. The Complainant is in the business of automotive parts and specializes in mechatronic automotive components such as systems for vehicle doors and seats among others.

The Complainant markets its products under the BROSE trademark and its portfolio of registered trademarks include:

BROSE United States of America Trademark registration number 2518898 date December 18, 2001, classes 9 and 12,

BROSE Canada Trademark registration number TMA686275 date April 19, 2007, classes 6,7, 9,11, 12, 20, 35, 37, 40, and 42,

BROSE United Kingdom Trademark registration number UK00801025629 date December 12, 2010, classes 7 and 11.

The Complainant operates <brose.com> which has been registered since 1994.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on June 27, 2025. The disputed domain name is currently not being used and is parked. At the time of filing the Complaint the disputed domain name resolved to a landing page which displayed sponsored links, assumable pay-per click links ("PPC"), such as "Electric Bike Rental San Diego", "Electric Bike Orange County" and "E City Folding Electric Bike".

The Complainant had sent several cease-and-desist notices to the Respondent on October 3, 2025, October 9, 2025, and on October 16, 2025. There was no reply to these notices from the Respondent.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant states that its trademark is reputed and widely known and is extensively used across several jurisdictions. The Complainant contends that its products include smart components, systems for vehicle doors and seats, electric motors for transmissions, steering, thermal management and drive systems for two wheelers.

Notably, the Complainant contends that, due to its system expertise, it is trusted by over 80 auto makers and 40 key suppliers around the globe. The Complainant alleges that every third new car is equipped with at least one BROSE SE product. The Complainant states that its net sales revenue in the year 2024 was EUR 7.7 billion. The Complainant states that it has 31,000 employees and owns 6,239 patents and operates from 68 locations in 24 countries and is named on the Forbes' lists for "World's Best Employers" in 2023.

The Complainant contends that it operates a website from its domain name <brose.com>, registered since 1994 and has a strong online presence. According to the Complainant, Similarweb.com, has ranked the Complainant's official website 4855 in its category, and during the month of December 2025, the website received 77,089 visits.

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark and the generic top-level domain (gTLD) “.group” along with its mark adds to the confusing similarity. The Complainant further argues that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name and has registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith. 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 did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

The Policy under paragraph 4 (a) requires the complainant to establish three elements to obtain the remedy of transfer of the disputed domain name under the Policy, these are:

- (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 lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith by the respondent.

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 provided evidence of its registered trademarks in various jurisdictions for the BROSE mark. The Panel finds that 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 disputed domain name consists of the Complainant’s mark and the gTLD extension “.group”. The Complainant has argued that being popularly known as “The Brose Group”, the use of the gTLD extension “. group” with the BROSE mark adds to confusingly similar of the disputed domain name with its mark.

The TLD is viewed as a standard registration requirement and is generally disregarded when assessing the confusing similarity of the disputed domain name with the mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.11.1 and section 1.11.2. The ordinary meaning ascribed to a TLD would not impact assessment of the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.2. The meaning of the TLD may however be relevant to the panel’s assessment of the second and third element.

The Panel finds the entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. The mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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. The material on record does not indicate that any of the circumstances under Paragraph 4(c) or any other circumstances exist to give rise to Respondent’s possible rights or legitimate interests in the 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.

The Respondent is responsible for the use of the disputed domain name, and the evidence on record shows that the disputed domain name previously resolved to a parked page that displayed various PPC links relating to vehicles, albeit 2-wheeled ones but also relating to electronic properties which is the Complainant’s area of business. The disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant’s mark. Panels have found that use of a disputed domain name to host a parked page comprising of PPC links does not represent legitimate use or a bona fide offering of goods or services, where links capitalize on the reputation associated with the complainant’s mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.9.

Furthermore, the Panel finds the Respondent’s choice of the “.group” gTLD for the disputed domain name, is evocative of the term “group”, which is a descriptive term that is likely to be associated with the Complainant. The Respondent’s selection of the gTLD would additionally support a finding that the Respondent intentionally obtained the disputed domain name to take advantage of the Complainant’s mark, and as such, the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.14.1.

For the reasons discussed, 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 provided any relevant submissions or evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been met by the Complainant.

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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

- (i) Circumstances indicate that the respondent has registered or acquired the domain name primarily for purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of respondent’s documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) The respondent has registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) the respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) By using the disputed domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the respondent’s website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the

respondent's website or location or of a product or service on the respondent's website.

In the present case, the Panel notes from the material on record, that the Complainant has established that BROSE mark was adopted and used by the Complainant much prior to the registration of the disputed domain name. The Respondent did not respond in these proceedings or provide any reason for the choice of the disputed domain name. Given the prior reputation and distinctiveness associated with the Complainant's mark and domain name, the mere registration of a disputed domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a widely known and reputed mark can by itself create a presumption of bad faith.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

The disputed domain name would misrepresent to a typical Internet user that any website that is operated using the disputed domain name is either associated or endorsed by the trademark owner or is its authorized licensees. Further, the Respondent has failed to respond or provide any explanation with supporting evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use for the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's mark and is currently being passively held with no content. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation associated with the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and the previous use of sponsored PPC links to obtain revenue through Internet traffic based on the reputation associated with the Complainant's mark, the Panel finds that under the circumstances of this case, the current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy. Even if the sponsored PPC links were automatically generated on the landing page where the disputed domain name is parked, the Respondent is responsible for the content appearing on the webpage associated with the disputed domain name and will not prevent a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.5.

Having reviewed the record, the entire set of circumstances discussed collectively constitutes bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name under the Policy provisions. 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 <brose.group> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Harini Narayanswamy/

Harini Narayanswamy

Sole Panelist

Date: April 2, 2026