

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Dirk Rossmann GmbH v. xin goq
Case No. D2026-2009

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Dirk Rossmann GmbH, Germany, represented by ZeroFox, United States of America.

The Respondent is xin goq, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <alterraco.com> and <babydreamsde.com> are registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 11, 2026. On May 11, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On May 13, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Registration Private) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 15, 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 amendment to the Complaint on May 15, 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 May 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Edoardo Fano as the sole panelist in this matter on June 15, 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.

The Panel has not received any requests from the Complainant or the Respondent regarding further submissions, waivers or extensions of deadlines, and the Panel has not found it necessary to request any further information from the Parties.

Having reviewed the communication records in the case file, the Panel finds that the Center has discharged its responsibility under the Rules, paragraph 2(a) "to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to [the] Respondent". Therefore, the Panel shall issue its Decision based upon the Complaint, the Policy, the Rules and the Supplemental Rules and without the benefit of a Response from the Respondent.

The language of the proceeding is English, being the language of the Registration Agreements, as per paragraph 11(a) of the Rules.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a German company founded in 1972 and operating as a drugstore chain in Europe. The Complainant owns several trademark registrations for ALTERRA and BABYDREAM, among which:

- European Union Trade Mark No. 018472918 for ALTERRA, registered on November 10, 2021; and
- German Trademark Registration No. 39833862 for BABYDREAM, registered on July 13, 1998.

The Complainant provided evidence in support of the above.

The Complainant also operates on the Internet, its main website being "www.rossmann.de", while as regards the trademark ALTERRA the Complainant operates the website "alterra-naturkosmetik.de".

The disputed domain names were both registered on July 17, 2025, and are currently inactive, although when the complaint was filed the browser tab for the disputed domain name <alterraco.com> displayed the Complainant's official ALTERRA logo as the site favicon and the disputed domain name <babydreamsde.com> resolved to generic "default server vhost" landing page - a server-default placeholder indicating that no website has been configured for the domain.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant states that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its trademarks ALTERRA and BABYDREAM, as the disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's trademarks in their entirety.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names since it has not been authorized by the Complainant to register the disputed domain names or to use its trademarks within the disputed domain names, it is not commonly known by the disputed domain names and it is not making either a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain names in bad faith, since the Complainant's trademarks ALTERRA and BABYDREAM are known in the field of drugstore operators. Therefore, the Respondent targeted the Complainant's trademarks at the time of registration of the disputed domain names, and the Complainant contends that the passive holding of the disputed domain names qualifies as bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

The Respondent has made no response to the Complainant's contentions and is in default. In reference to paragraphs 5(f) and 14 of the Rules, no exceptional circumstances explaining the default have been put forward or are apparent from the record.

A respondent is not obliged to participate in a proceeding under the Policy, but if it fails to do so, reasonable facts asserted by a complainant – if adequately supported by evidence – may be taken as true, and appropriate inferences, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, may be drawn. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, Third Edition ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)) section 4.3.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which the Complainant must satisfy in order to succeed:

- (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are 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 names. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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 Panel finds the marks ALTERRA and BABYDREAM are recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of other letters, here the combination of “co”, in the disputed domain name <alterraco.com>, and the combination of “sde”, in the disputed domain name <babydreamsde.com>, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such letters does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Complainant's trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

It is also well accepted that a generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”), in this case “.com”, is typically ignored when assessing the similarity between a trademark and a domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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.

While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, UDRP panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often-impossible 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 names. 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 present record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

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.

In the present case, regarding the registration in bad faith of the disputed domain names, the reputation of the Complainant’s trademarks ALTERRA and BABYDREAM in the field of drugstore operators is clearly established and the Panel finds that the Respondent more likely than not knew of the Complainant and deliberately registered the disputed domain names due to the likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademarks, especially because, as far as the disputed domain name <alterraco.com> is concerned, its site favicon displayed the Complainant’s official ALTERRA logo.

As regards the current use of the disputed domain names, being inactive, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or “coming soon” page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant’s trademarks in the field of drugstore operators, the nature of the disputed domain names, wholly incorporating the Complainant’s trademarks with the mere addition of the letters “co” (standing for “company”) in the disputed domain name <alterraco.com>, and “sde” in the disputed domain name <babydreamsde.com> (“s” making “babydream” plural and “de” standing for Germany, the Complainant’s country), the fact that the Respondent has targeted two distinct marks of the Complainant, and the failure of the Respondent to submit a Response or provide any explanation for its motivations in registering the disputed domain names, and finds that in the circumstances of this case, the passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of 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 names <alterraco.com> and <babydreamsde.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Edoardo Fano/

Edoardo Fano

Sole Panelist

Date: June 25, 2026