

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

CA Indosuez (Switzerland) SA v. Detlef Baur
Case No. D2026-0762

1. The Parties

The Complainant is CA Indosuez (Switzerland) SA, Switzerland, represented by id est avocats Sàrl, Switzerland.

The Respondent is Detlef Baur, Germany.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <thaler.info> is registered with Sav.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 23, 2026. On February 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 24, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details. The Complainant filed amendments to the Complaint on February 26, 2026 and March 3, 2026.

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 March 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 26, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 30, 2026.

The Center appointed Wilson Pinheiro Jabur as the sole panelist in this matter on April 2, 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 the Crédit Agricole Group, founded in 1876. The Complainant merged with Banque Thaler SA (Bank Thaler AG), a Swiss bank, being now its legal successor (Appendix 3 to the Complaint).

The Complainant operates, amongst others, the domain name <banquethaler.com>. The Complainant is the owner of the following, amongst others, of other trademark registrations (Appendix 7 to the Complaint):

- Swiss trademark registration No. 470901 for the word and device mark THALER, registered on March 29, 2000, successively renewed, in class 36;
- Swiss trademark registration No. 476020 for the word and device mark BANQUE THALER, registered on September 11, 2000, successively renewed, in class 36; and
- Swiss trademark registration No. 827352 for the word and device mark BANQUE THALER., registered on February 28, 2025, in class 36.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 5, 2026, and resolves to a parked webpage.

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical to the THALER trademark owned by the Complainant, being such identity likely to cause confusion.

The Complainant further states that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect to the disputed domain name given that:

- a) the Complainant's trademarks were all registered before the creation date of the disputed domain name;
- b) given the accuracy or extreme similarity of the disputed domain name with the Complainant's trademark the Respondent has no legitimate interest and rather seeks to give the illusion of an association with the Complainant; and
- c) there is no active use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further asserts that the disputed domain name is identical to its trademark creating a presumption of bad faith under the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 3.1.4. The Respondent's bad faith is further corroborated by the Respondent's concealing its true identity and the lack of any good faith active use of the disputed domain name. Lastly, the Complainant points out that, as a Swiss bank, it is subject to the FINMA Circular 2023/1 (Operational Risks and Resilience), which mandates the proactive mitigation of "cyber-attack surfaces"; and, given that in the banking sector, lookalike domain names are widely recognized as primary instruments for phishing and financial fraud and the Complainant's high degree of regulation and the sensitive nature of banking secrecy, there is no plausible good-faith explanation for the Respondent's registration of a confusingly similar domain name. Furthermore, under the Complainant's view, the passive holding of the disputed domain name must be deemed to constitute bad faith, considering the latent threat to the integrity of the financial system and the risk of fraud.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy sets forth three requirements, which have to be met for this Panel to order the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the 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 Complainant must prove in this administrative proceeding that each of the aforesaid three elements is present in order to obtain the transfer of the disputed domain name.

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 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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the 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.

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 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.

In that sense, and according to the evidence submitted, the Complainant has made a prima facie case against the Respondent, named Detlef Baur, who has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name and is neither authorized, licensed, nor been allowed to use the Complainant's trademark, whether in the disputed domain name, or in any other way.

Also, the lack of evidence as to any trademarks registered by the Respondent corresponding to the disputed domain name, corroborates the indication of an absence of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Under these circumstances and absent evidence to the contrary, the Panel finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name.

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.

This case presents the following circumstances which indicate under the balance of probabilities bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name:

- a) the Respondent has provided no evidence whatsoever of any actual or contemplated good faith use by it of the disputed domain name;
- b) the disputed domain name consists of the entirety of the Complainant's THALER trademark, thus carrying a high risk of implied affiliation;
- c) the Complainant might be targeted of undue use of the THALER trademark in connection with phishing scams (as noted in the website available at the domain name <banquethaler.com>); and
- d) the present passive holding of the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

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 <thaler.info> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Wilson Pinheiro Jabur/

Wilson Pinheiro Jabur

Sole Panelist

Date: April 15, 2026