

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

BLG Logistics Group AG & Co. KG v. Sascha Emmanuel
Case No. D2026-2300

1. The Parties

The Complainant is BLG Logistics Group AG & Co. KG, Germany, represented by Nameshield, France.

The Respondent is Sascha Emmanuel, Germany.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <blg-germany.com> is registered with IONOS SE (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 28, 2026. On May 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 1, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 3, 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 in English on June 4, 2026.

On June 3, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in German and English, that the Language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is German. On June 4, 2026, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

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 in German and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 25, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Pascal Böhner as the sole panelist in this matter on July 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, BLG Logistics Group AG & Co. KG, is a seaport and logistics service provider with an international network, founded in 1877. The Complainant operates almost 100 locations and branches across Europe, America, Africa, and Asia.

The Complainant holds the following registered trademarks for BLG LOGISTICS:

- 1) European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO) trademark No. 19064627 BLG LOGISTICS, registered on December 27, 2024;
- 2) International trademark No. 1860476 BLG LOGISTICS, registered on February 6, 2025;
- 3) United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) trademark No. 8073002 BLG LOGISTICS, registered on December 23, 2025.

The Complainant also operates the domain name <blg-logistics.com>, registered since October 31, 2004.

The disputed domain name <blg-germany.com> was registered on May 12, 2026 by the Respondent, Sascha Emmanuel, purportedly located in Germany. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a parking page hosted by the Registrar. It has also been used in connection with a phishing scheme, in which an email address associated with the disputed domain name was employed to pass the Respondent off as an employee of the Complainant.

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.

With respect to the first element, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its BLG LOGISTICS trademark. The Complainant argues that the dominant element "blg" is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name, and that the addition of the geographical term "Germany" – the Complainant's country of origin – is insufficient to avoid a likelihood of confusion. The Complainant further contends that the generic Top-Level Domain ".com" does not alter the overall impression of the designation as being connected to the Complainant and its trademark.

With respect to the second element, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant states that the Respondent is not identified in the Whois database by a name corresponding to the disputed domain name, that no license or authorization has been granted to the Respondent to use the Complainant's trademark, and that the Respondent has no affiliation with the Complainant. The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent has used an email address associated with the disputed domain name to pass itself off as an employee of the Complainant in furtherance of a phishing scheme, which cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under the Policy.

With respect to the third element, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant argues that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant's well-known BLG LOGISTICS mark, and that the use of an associated email address to pass itself off as a Complainant's employee is evidence of bad faith under

Policy, paragraphs 4(b)(iii) and 4(b)(iv), as such conduct is disruptive to the Complainant's business and constitutes an intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users or third parties by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is German. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. On June 4, 2026, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding, submitting that English is the language most widely used in international relations and one of the working languages of the Center, and that requiring translation into German would impose a disproportionate financial burden on the Complainant, likely exceeding the overall cost of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant's request.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the Registration Agreement, the Panel must do so judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the Parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.5.1.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name itself incorporates the English word "Germany", which constitutes an indication that the Respondent may be familiar with the English language. This factor, together with the circumstance that the Center has communicated with both parties in German and English throughout the proceeding – thereby ensuring that the Respondent was fully informed of the case in the language of the Registration Agreement – and the Respondent's failure to participate in the proceeding at all, leads the Panel to the conclusion that requiring the Complainant to translate the Complaint into German would impose an unwarranted burden without any procedural benefit and unnecessarily delay the proceeding.

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

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 the trademark BLG LOGISTICS for the purposes of the Policy, by virtue of its registered trademarks as mentioned in Section 4. above. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark BLG LOGISTICS is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The dominant element "blg" is reproduced in its entirety as the lead element of the disputed domain name. Although the addition of the geographical term "germany" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, it

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. Further, the Panel finds that the fraudulent use of the disputed domain name in this case supports a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. The generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.

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 is not identified in the Whois database by a name corresponding to the disputed domain name. No license or authorization has been granted to the Respondent to use the Complainant's BLG LOGISTICS trademark. The Respondent has no demonstrated affiliation with the Complainant.

Furthermore, the Respondent has used an email address associated with the disputed domain name to pass itself off as an employee of the Complainant in furtherance of a phishing scheme. Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for phishing can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1. Such conduct is plainly not a bona fide offering of goods or services under Policy, paragraph 4(c)(i), nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under Policy, paragraph 4(c)(iii).

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.

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.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 12, 2026, years after the Complainant's BLG LOGISTICS trademark has been used in commerce and long after the Complainant had established a well-known international presence in the logistics sector. The Panel finds it inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its mark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent used an email address associated with the disputed domain name to attempt to pass itself off as an employee of the Complainant in furtherance of a phishing scheme. Such conduct is disruptive to

the Complainant's business, and constitutes an intentional attempt to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark for commercial gain within the meaning of Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

Furthermore, panels have held that the use of a domain name for phishing constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. 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 <blg-germany.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Pascal Böhner/

Pascal Böhner

Sole Panelist

Date: July 15, 2026