

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

OSRAM GmbH v. Atif Raza, Osram International
Case No. D2026-2542

1. The Parties

The Complainant is OSRAM GmbH, Germany, represented by pm.legal, Germany.

The Respondent is Atif Raza, Osram International, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <osramindustries.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 June 11, 2026. On June 11, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 11, 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 (John Doe) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 12, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to amend the Complaint. On June 17, 2026, the Complainant requested an extension of the due date for amendment of the Complaint until June 24, 2026. On the same day, the Center extended the due date for amendment of the Complaint until June 24, 2026. On June 25, 2026, the Complainant again requested an extension of the due date for amendment of the Complaint until July 1, 2026. On the same date, the Center extended the due date for amendment of the Complaint until July 1, 2026. The Complainant submitted an amended Complaint on July 1, 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 July 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 22, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev as the sole panelist in this matter on July 28, 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 ams OSRAM group, a leading global manufacturer of photonics solutions and lighting technology. Its brand OSRAM was created in 1906, and the company was formally established in 1919. The ams OSRAM group has about 18,500 employees worldwide and its revenues for 2025 amount to EUR 3.3 billion. The Complainant and its subsidiaries operate official websites at the domain names <osram.com>, registered on March 25, 1999, <osram.de>, registered on April 24, 1996, and <osram.pk>, registered on April 6, 2009.

The Complainant is the owner of various trademark registrations for OSRAM (the "OSRAM trademark"), including the following representative registrations:

- the Pakistani trademark OSRAM (word) with registration No. 4577, registered on April 7, 1949, for goods in International Class 9;
- the Pakistani trademark OSRAM (word) with registration No. 4578, registered on April 7, 1949, for goods in International Class 11;
- the European Union Trade Mark OSRAM (word) with registration No. 000027490, registered on April 17, 1998, for goods and services in International Classes 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 14, 17, 21, 28, and 42; and
- the European Union Trade Mark **OSRAM** (combined) with registration No. 001680461, registered on September 27, 2001, for goods and services in International Classes 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 25, 28, 35, 37, and 42.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 23, 2026. It resolves to a website displaying on the top of every page the logo:



The website also displaying the logo:



The Respondent's website offers various products under different brands, including and describes its provider as follows:

"Osram Industries is a trusted fast moving consumer goods manufacturing and trading company aiming to distribute quality goods to delight its consumers across Pakistan".

The Respondent's website also states "The legacy of trust since 1975", "Currently present in 26 countries", and "No of employees 1000+".

The Respondent has not provided any information about itself in this proceeding. The Complainant submits that the Respondent is a natural person from Pakistan who has filed three trademark applications for OSRAM in Pakistan jointly with another person in 2024 and 2025, and that the Complainant has commenced opposition proceedings against these trademark applications. There is no information in the case file about the outcome of the opposition proceedings and the status of the Respondent's trademark applications. As noted by the Complainant, a search in the official Pakistani website for company name searches, maintained

by the Securities & Exchange Commission of Pakistan¹ returns no results for the names “Osram Industries” and “Osram International”, and only lists a company of the Complainant’s group.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its OSRAM trademark, because it fully incorporates the trademark, which is recognisable within it. The Complainant adds that the dictionary word “industries” does not distinguish the disputed domain name from the OSRAM trademark.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, because the Complainant has not permitted it to use the OSRAM trademark or to register and use domain names incorporating this trademark, and the Respondent is not commonly known under the disputed domain name. The Complainant adds that the official Pakistani company search website does not show the existence of an entity with the name “Osram Industries” or “Osram International”.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Rather, the Respondent is using it to offer various products under different brands, including the Osram brand, and the logos displayed on the website at the disputed domain name imitate the Complainant’s logo. According to the Complainant, this creates a misleading impression that the Respondent is affiliated with the Complainant.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent’s trademark applications, all of which have been opposed by the Complainant, do not confer any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain name, because they were made primarily to prevent or circumvent the Complainant’s assertion of its rights. The trademark applications were filed long after the Complainant had established its rights in the OSRAM trademark in Pakistan, and “osram” is not a dictionary word and has no meaning independent of the Complainant’s brand. According to the Complainant, it is unlikely that the Respondent has independently chosen the names “Osram Industries” and “Osram International” and sought to register them without knowledge of the Complainant. The Complainant adds that the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to it, “osram” is not a word that a domain name registrant would choose unless seeking to create an impression of an association with the Complainant. In the Complainant’s submission, taking into account its high profile worldwide, the fact that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name after its trademark applications had been opposed by the Complainant, and the fact that the Respondent copies the Complainant’s logo on the website at the disputed domain name, it is inconceivable that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name unaware of the Complainant and its rights in the OSRAM trademark. Rather, the Respondent’s intent was to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s OSRAM trademark and to divert traffic intended for the Complainant’s website to the website at the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

¹ See <https://eservices.secp.gov.pk/eServices/ControllerServlet>

6. Discussion and Findings

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.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the OSRAM trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the OSRAM trademark is recognisable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the OSRAM trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "industries") 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 OSRAM trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's distinctive OSRAM trademark which has been widely used in many countries around the world and whose registration in Pakistan dates from 1949. The Respondent's trademark applications in Pakistan were opposed by the Complainant prior to the registration of the disputed domain name. This supports a conclusion that the Respondent must have been well aware of the Complainant's trademark rights when it registered the disputed domain name.

There is no evidence for the existence of a Pakistani entity related to the Respondent with the names "Osram Industries" or "Osram International", although the Respondent provided one of these names for the purposes of the registration of the disputed domain name and indicated the other one as the provider of its website.

The Respondent's website prominently display two different "osram" logos whose textual elements identically copy the OSRAM trademark, and its website is being used to promote various products, including products branded with the Respondent's "osram" logos and products branded with other brands, without displaying any disclaimer for the absence of a relationship with the Complainant.

Considering the above and the absence of any plausible explanation by the Respondent of the reasons why its conduct should be regarded as legitimate, it appears to the Panel as more likely than not that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in an attempt to illegitimately exploit the goodwill of the Complainant's OSRAM trademark for commercial gain. Such conduct cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel therefore finds that 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.

As discussed in section 6.B above, the evidence in the case supports a conclusion that the Respondent must have had knowledge of the Complainant's OSRAM trademark (registered in Pakistan since 1949) when registering the disputed domain name in 2026, and it appears that its registration and use have been carried out in an attempt to exploit this trademark for commercial gain by misleading Internet users as to the source or endorsement by the Complainant of the Respondent's website and of the products promoted on it. This supports a finding of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel therefore 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 <osramindustries.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Assen Alexiev/

Assen Alexiev

Sole Panelist

Date: August 11, 2026