

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

BioNTech SE v. Deloitte LLT

Case No. D2026-1736

1. The Parties

The Complainant is BioNTech SE, Germany, represented by MSA IP - Milojevic Sekulic & Associates, Serbia.

The Respondent is Deloitte LLT, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <infobiontech.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 23, 2026. On April 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 23, 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 (Data Redacted) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 24, 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 April 29, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint [together with the amendment to the Complaint/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 April 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 20, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 21, 2026.

The Center appointed Rodrigo Azevedo as the sole panelist in this matter on June 1, 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, BioNTech SE, is a German biotechnology company founded in 2008. The Complainant develops and manufactures active immunotherapies for the treatment of cancer and other diseases, including pharmaceutical candidates based on messenger RNA (mRNA), and vaccines against infectious diseases. The Complainant is also known for its cooperation with Pfizer in connection with the BioNTech/Pfizer COVID-19 vaccine.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for BIONTECH in several jurisdictions, including the European Union Trademark Registration No. 008964447, registered on December 22, 2010.

The Complainant also owns and operates domain names incorporating the BIONTECH trademark, including <biontech.com>, registered on May 29, 1998.

The disputed domain name <infobiontech.com> was registered on April 4, 2026.

The disputed domain name resolves to a parking page provided by the Registrar, Hostinger, and the Complainant states that MX records have been configured for the disputed domain name.

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:

(i) The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant asserts that it owns rights in the BIONTECH trademark through its trademark registrations and extensive use of the mark. The disputed domain name incorporates the BIONTECH trademark in its entirety, with the addition of the term "info" as a prefix and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com". The addition of this term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

(ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the BIONTECH trademark or to register any domain name incorporating it. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and is not making any bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name resolves only to a parking page, and the configuration of MX records creates a risk that the disputed domain name may be used for email-related abuse or phishing.

(iii) The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant contends that the BIONTECH trademark is well known and that the Respondent could not reasonably have been unaware of the Complainant and its trademark when registering the disputed domain name. The Respondent's registration of a domain name consisting of the term "info" together with the BIONTECH trademark targets Internet users seeking information about the Complainant. The Complainant further argues that the disputed domain name's use for a parking page, the configuration of MX records, the Respondent's failure to respond to the Complainant's contact attempt, and the use of privacy or incomplete registrant details support a finding of bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that in order to be entitled to a transfer of the disputed domain name, a complainant shall prove the following three elements:

- (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.

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.

Annex 8 to the Complaint shows valid registrations of BIONTECH trademarks obtained by the Complainant since at least 2010. Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 trademark BIONTECH is wholly encompassed within the disputed domain name, together with the prefix "info", as well as with the gTLD ".com".

Although the addition of other terms (here, "info") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

It is also well established that the addition of a gTLD, such as ".com", is typically disregarded when determining whether a domain name is confusingly similar to a complainant's trademark as such is viewed as a standard registration requirement. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's BIONTECH trademark, and 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 the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the Respondent is not an authorized reseller, nor has it obtained any permission for such reproduction of the BIONTECH trademark. 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.

The Complainant has not licensed nor authorized the use of its well-known trademark to the Respondent, and the Panel finds no indication that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the Complainant has shown that MX records have been configured for the disputed domain name, creating a risk that the disputed domain name may be used for email-related abuse or phishing.

Based on the available record, 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.

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.

The Panel concludes that it is not likely that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant's trademark and that the registration of the disputed domain name was a mere coincidence.

When the disputed domain name was registered (in 2026) the BIONTECH trademark was already famous and directly connected with the Complainant's medicine products.

Also, the Panel considers that the addition of the prefix "info" to the disputed domain name is not sufficient to eliminate the potential for confusion, and may even be interpreted as an allusion to an official source of information on BIONTECH company and products.

Currently the disputed domain name is linked to a parking page hosted by its respective registrar. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name 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 still 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 of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition 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 situation is aggravated by the said configuration of MX records, suggesting that email messages may be being sent using the disputed domain name, which would easily mislead the Complainant's customers.

Finally, the absence of a formal reply from the Respondent to the Complainant's contentions and of any justification for the use of the Complainant's trademark is further evidence of bad faith in registering and using the disputed domain name in the present case.

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 <infobiontech.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Rodrigo Azevedo/

Rodrigo Azevedo

Sole Panelist

Date: June 4, 2026