

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sennheiser electronic SE & Co. KG v. Teng Xuexuan  
Case No. D2026-2015

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Sennheiser electronic SE & Co. KG, Germany, represented by Bettinger Rechtsanwälte Partnerschaft mbB, Germany.

The Respondent is Teng Xuexuan, China.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sennheisera.com> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the “Registrar”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 9, 2026. On May 11, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 12, 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 (Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 13, 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 May 15, 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 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 Mireille Buydens as the sole panelist in this matter on June 16, 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 company founded in Germany in 1945, which operates in the audio industry. The Complainant specializes in the design and production of a broad variety of premium audio products, including microphones, headphones, wireless technologies and all-round audio solutions. The Complainant has more than 2,800 employees and manufacturing plants in Germany, Ireland and the United States of America (“United States”), as well as sales subsidiaries and research laboratories worldwide.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademarks for SENNHEISER (hereafter “the SENNHEISER Trademark” or “the Trademark”) in various jurisdictions around the world including:

- the International trademark registration no. 670839 for SENNHEISER (word mark), registered on March 6, 1997, and notably covering China;
- the International trademark registration no. 590780 for SENNHEISER (word and device mark), registered on August 10, 1992, and notably covering China;
- The Chinese trademark registration no. 34663956 for SENNHEISER (word mark), registered on July 7, 2019;
- the European Union trademark registration no. 000370122 for SENNHEISER (word mark), registered on August 27, 1999;

The Complainant is the owner of numerous domain names including its SENNHEISER Trademark registered under various generic Top-Level Domains (“gTLD”) as well as under a number of country code Top-level Domains, e.g. <sennheiser.com> and <sennheisershop.com>.

The Complainant promotes its products and services in particular on its website, accessible in German, English and other international languages. The Complainant also provides content to the social-media platforms Facebook, Instagram, X, and YouTube, which are also promoting its SENNHEISER Trademark.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 27, 2026. It resolves to an online shop that presents itself as a Sennheiser-branded e-commerce website. The website prominently depicts the SENNHEISER Trademark and logo, and the footer claims “Copyright © 2026 Sennheiser electronic SE & Co. KG | Germany. All rights reserved”. The website under the disputed domain name further offers products under categories corresponding to the Complainant’s genuine product range, including “Microphones”, “Wireless Systems”, “Meeting & Conference Systems”, “Headphones”, “Monitoring”, “Software”, “Accessories”, and “Merchandise”. The pictures of the products on the home page of the website under the disputed domain name are the same as on the Complainant official website under <sennheiser.com>, and the lay-out and graphic charter of the website is also almost identical. The website under the disputed domain name also uses the SENNHEISER Trademark on the product pages, presenting the products as genuine SENNHEISER products (e.g.: “If you’ve heard music, you’ve heard the MD 421 — a legendary Sennheiser microphone featured in countless award-winning performances and productions over the last five decades”). The products are however offered for sale at highly discounted prices compared to the prices on the Complainant’s official website. The footer of the website lists an address in a city in the United States, but the stated ZIP/postal code does not correspond to the city or to the state.

## **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.

First, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's SENNHEISER Trademark. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's SENNHEISER Trademark in its entirety. The mere addition of the letter "a" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. On the contrary, the addition of a single, non-distinctive character to a well-known trademark is a classic form of typosquatting and does not materially alter the overall impression conveyed by the domain name. The generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is a standard registration requirement and is disregarded for the purposes of the confusing similarity assessment.

Second, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not licensed, authorized, permitted or otherwise consented to the Respondent's registration or use of the disputed domain name, nor to the Respondent's use of the Complainant's SENNHEISER Trademark for any other purpose. The Respondent is not an authorized dealer, distributor, reseller or service provider of the Complainant. There is also no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services. The disputed domain name resolves to a website that imitates a SENNHEISER branded online shop and offers products corresponding to the Complainant's genuine product range. The website uses the Complainant's SENNHEISER Trademark prominently, reproduces Sennheiser product names, and falsely claims copyright in the name of "Sennheiser electronic SE & Co. KG | Germany". This creates the misleading impression that the website is operated by, affiliated with, or authorized by the Complainant. It offers purported Sennheiser products at implausibly low prices, and provides invalid contact information, including an address for which the postal code, city and street address do not correspond to each other.

The Complainant finally contends that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith. Concerning the registration in bad faith, the Complainant asserts that, given the distinctiveness and reputation of the SENNHEISER Trademark, it is inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without actual knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark rights. The Respondent deliberately chose a domain name that fully incorporates the SENNHEISER Trademark, with the mere addition of the letter "a", a minor variation that does not alter the recognizable character of the Trademark. Such conduct is indicative of intentional targeting of the Complainant's trademark and constitutes classic typosquatting.

Concerning the use in bad faith, the Complainant contends that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to operate a website that falsely presents itself as an official or authorized Sennheiser online shop. The website prominently displays the Complainant's SENNHEISER Trademark, the Complainant's official product names, and brand-related marketing content, and offers purported SENNHEISER products at deeply discounted prices. This conduct is clearly designed to mislead Internet users into believing that the website is operated by, affiliated with, or endorsed by the Complainant. The absence of any transparent identification of the website operator, combined with the imitation of the Complainant's official website and the highly discounted pricing, further reinforces the conclusion that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith.

### **B. Respondent**

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

## 6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that the Complainant proves each of the following three elements in order to succeed in its Complaint:

- (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 has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name was 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.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the entirety of the SENNHEISER Trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the SENNHEISER Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The only difference between the SENNHEISER Trademark and the disputed domain name is the addition of the letter "a" at the end. A domain name which consists of a variation of a trademark (typically a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling, referred to as typosquatting) is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

Further, the gTLD ".com" is a standard registration requirement and is typically disregarded in the confusing similarity test. . [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.

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.

According to the Complaint, which has not been rebutted by the Respondent, the Respondent is not licensed by, nor affiliated with, the Complainant in any way. The Respondent is not an authorized dealer, distributor, reseller or service provider of the Complainant. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor is there any evidence of use or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services. There is no evidence of legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, either. On the contrary, the Panel first notes that the disputed domain name reproduces the SENNHEISER Trademark with the mere addition of the letter "a", which may go unnoticed to most Internet users and constitutes classic typosquatting. As a result, the disputed domain name in itself carries a risk of implied affiliation, which cannot constitute fair use as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant.

The Panel further notes the impersonating nature of the content exhibited on the website at the disputed domain name: the website prominently reproduces the SENNHEISER Trademark, uses the same lay-out and graphic charter as the Complainant's official website, contains pictures that are identical to the pictures on the Complainant's official website, offers identical products with product descriptions referring to the Complainants, and also contains a false copyright notice "Copyright © 2026 Sennheiser electronic SE & Co. KG | Germany. All rights reserved". In the Panel's view, these elements, combined with the highly discounted prices, demonstrate that the disputed domain name is being used for a fraudulent online shop intended to deceive consumers seeking the Complainant's genuine products. The Respondent induces Internet users into falsely believing that the disputed domain name resolves to a website operated or endorsed by the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed impersonation/passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

Concerning the registration in bad faith, the Panel notes that the Respondent has composed the disputed domain name by reproducing the SENNHEISER Trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the letter "a" at the end. Noting the near instantaneous and global reach of the Internet and search engines, and particularly where the complainant's trademark is widely known as it is the case here, and the respondent cannot credibly claim to have been unaware of the trademark, panels have been prepared to infer that the respondent knew, or have found that the respondent should have known, that its registration would be confusingly similar to a complainant's mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2. Taking into account the reputation of the Complainants' SENNHEISER Trademark, registered decades before the disputed domain name (including in China, where the Respondent is purportedly located) and widely used worldwide (including on the Internet), the Panel takes the view that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant's SENNHEISER Trademark when it registered the disputed domain name and registered it with the intention to mislead Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name is affiliated with, or endorsed by, the Complainant. This conclusion is reinforced by the fact that, as explained above, the disputed domain name resolves to a website impersonating the Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here impersonating or passing off, constitutes bad faith. In the present case, the disputed domain name resolves to a website offering microphones, head-sets and other audio related products which are identical or at least very similar to the products sold by the Complainant. The Respondent passes itself off as the Complainant: the website prominently depicts the SENNHEISER Trademark and logo, has the same lay-out and graphic charter as the Complainant's official website, offers the same types of products using the same pictures as the Complainant, and the footer claims "Copyright © 2026 Sennheiser electronic SE & Co. KG | Germany. All rights reserved". The website under the disputed domain name further presents the offered products as genuine SENNHEISER products (e.g.: "If you've heard music, you've heard the MD 421 — a legendary Sennheiser microphone featured in countless award-winning performances and productions over the last five decades"). The products are however offered for sale at highly discounted prices compared to the prices on the Complainant's official website. The footer of the website lists an address in a city in the United States, but the stated ZIP/postal code does not correspond to the city or to the state. In light of this, it seems inconceivable that the Respondent would have registered and used the disputed domain name for a reason other than seeking to unduly benefit from the Complainant, its SENNHEISER Trademark, and associated goodwill.

Having reviewed the record, 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 <sennheisera.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Mireille Buydens/*

**Mireille Buydens**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 21, 2026