

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sennheiser electronic SE & Co. KG v. xinz hui, 林智鑫 (lin zhi xin), 马磊 (malei), 徐辉 (xuhui), 高源 (gaoyuan), 王清晓 (wangqingxiao), lino fuxin, xint huir, linca fuxin
Case No. D2026-2814

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are xinz hui, Germany, 林智鑫 (lin zhi xin), China, 马磊 (malei), China, 徐辉 (xuhui), China, 高源 (gaoyuan), China, 王清晓 (wangqingxiao), China, lino fuxin, Germany, xint huir, Germany, and linca fuxin, Germany.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <sennheiser-romania.com>, and <sennheiser-turkiye.com> are registered with EU Technology (HK) Limited. The disputed domain names <sennheiser-au.com>, <sennheiser-colombia.com>, <sennheiser-deutschland.com>, <sennheiser-france.com>, <sennheiser-portugal.com>, <sennheiser-sverige.com>, <sennheiser-uae.com>, and <sennheisermagyarorszag.com> are registered with Bangning Digital Technology Co., Ltd. The disputed domain names <sennheiser-canada.com>, and <sennheiser-nz.com> are registered with BF Internet Limited.¹ The disputed domain names <sennheiser-italia.com>, <sennheiser-mexico.com>, <sennheiser-norge.com>, <sennheiser-southafrica.com>, <sennheiser-suomi.com>, and <sennheiserespana.com> are registered with Guizhou Zhongyu Zhike Network Technology Co., Ltd. The disputed domain names <sennheiser-chile.com>, <sennheiserireland.com>, <sennheiser-india.com>, <sennheiser-nederland.com>, and <sennheiser-polska.com> are registered with Xin Net Technology Corporation. (the “Registrars”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 29, 2026. On June 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 30, and July 10, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their respective verification responses disclosing registrant and contact

¹ On August 10, 2026, the Registrar, BF Internet Limited, confirmed that their name has been changed from Kenpai International Technology Limited to the current name with the same IANA ID 4543.

information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (“Respondent(s) under common control”) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 10, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint in English on July 12, 2026.

On July 10, 2026, the Center informed the parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain names <sennheiser-nz.com>, <sennheiser-canada.com>, <sennheiser-chile.com>, <sennheiserireland.com>, <sennheiser-nederland.com>, <sennheiser-india.com>, <sennheiser-polska.com>, <sennheiser-romania.com>, <sennheiser-turkiye.com>, <sennheiser-italia.com>, <sennheiser-mexico.com>, <sennheiser-norge.com>, <sennheiser-southafrica.com>, <sennheiser-suomi.com>, and <sennheiserespana.com> is Chinese. On July 12, 2026, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondents 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 Respondents in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 14, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 3, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on August 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Deanna Wong Wai Man as the sole panelist in this matter on August 12, 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, Sennheiser electronic SE & Co. KG, is a German audio company founded in 1945 as Laboratorium Wennebostel by Fritz Sennheiser. It develops and produces audio products and systems, including microphones, headphones, wireless technologies, headsets, conferencing systems, speakers, and related professional audio solutions. The Complainant has its headquarters in Wedemark, Germany, and maintains an international sales and service presence. Its website presents products and applications for, among other areas, headphones, microphones, wireless systems, live production and touring, studio recording, and business communications.

The Complainant is the owner of an international trademark portfolio for SENNHEISER, including but not limited to the following: International Registration No. 590780, for the mark SENNHEISER, registered on August 10, 1992, for goods in Class 9; and European Union Trademark Registration No. 000370122, for SENNHEISER, registered on August 27, 1999, for goods in Classes 9, 10, and 16. The Panel notes that various panels applying the Policy have recognised the Complainant’s SENNHEISER marks as well-known trademarks, and the Panel agrees with this assessment, see for instance *Sennheiser electronic GmbH & Co. KG v. Augustine Dominic, Dominic Augustine*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3994](#).

The disputed domain names were all registered on the same day namely April 9, 2026. At the time of the submission of the Complaint, the disputed domain names <sennheiser-deutschland.com> and <sennheiser-sverige.com> directed to localized online shops using SENNHEISER branding, product images, product categories, discount badges, and ecommerce functionality, with German and Swedish language and pricing respectively. The disputed domain name <sennheiser-au.com> directed to a website of an English-language shop when accessed from an Australian IP address and otherwise returned a “406 Not Acceptable” response. The remaining disputed domain names directed to inactive or error websites. Upon the Panel’s verification, on the date of this Decision, only the disputed domain name <sennheiser-sverige.com> still directs to an active website displaying a localized Swedish e-commerce website.

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 contends that it has registered rights in the SENNHEISER trademark and that each of the disputed domain names incorporates that trademark in its entirety, together with a country or geographic term, including terms such as “deutschland”, “france”, “canada”, “sverige”, “norge”, “suomi”, “turkiye”, “uae”, “southafrica”, “espana”, and “magyarország”. It submits that the geographic additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity and, in the circumstances, may increase the likelihood that Internet users would regard the disputed domain names as referring to official national or regional SENNHEISER websites. The Complainant further submits that the “.com” suffix is to be disregarded for the purpose of comparison.

As to rights or legitimate interests, the Complainant contends that it has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondents to register or use the disputed domain names or the SENNHEISER trademark, and that there is no affiliation or other relationship between the Parties. It further submits that there is no evidence that any Respondent is commonly known by any of the disputed domain names. The Complainant contends that the use of at least three of the disputed domain names for purported SENNHEISER online shops, which use SENNHEISER branding, product images, localized content, discount offers, and ecommerce functionality, cannot constitute a bona fide offering because the websites create an impression of affiliation with the Complainant. It also submits that the “406 Not Acceptable” pages associated with the remaining disputed domain names do not establish any rights or legitimate interests, particularly in light of the surrounding circumstances, and that any purported reseller use would be misleading because the websites do not prominently disclose the absence of a relationship with the Complainant.

As to bad faith, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered with knowledge of and with the intention to target the SENNHEISER trademark, which it submits had been registered and used for decades and was internationally well-known by April 9, 2026. It relies in particular on the simultaneous registration of 23 disputed domain names incorporating SENNHEISER and country or geographic terms, the recurring name-server configurations, common or closely connected hosting infrastructure, and the substantially similar website behavior as evidence of a coordinated pattern of registrations. The Complainant contends that the purported online shops constitute use in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy because they seek to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. In relation to the disputed domain names returning “406 Not Acceptable”, the Complainant relies on the circumstances surrounding the registrations and the related active websites, contending that the apparent non-use does not preclude a finding of bad faith.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 First Preliminary Issue: Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain names <sennheiser-nz.com>, <sennheiser-canada.com>, <sennheiser-chile.com>, <sennheiserireland.com>, <sennheiser-nederland.com>, <sennheiser-india.com>, <sennheiser-polska.com>, <sennheiser-romania.com>, <sennheiser-turkiye.com>, <sennheiser-italia.com>, <sennheiser-mexico.com>, <sennheiser-norge.com>, <sennheiser-southafrica.com>, <sennheiser-suomi.com>, and <sennheiserespana.com> is Chinese. The Registration Agreements for the remaining disputed domain names are in English. Pursuant to paragraph 11(a) of the Rules, in the absence of an agreement between the Parties or unless otherwise specified in the Registration Agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the Registration Agreement.

The Complaint and amended Complaint were filed in English. The Complainant requested that English be the language of the proceeding, submitting, among other arguments, that the disputed domain names comprise Latin characters only, that <sennheiser-au.com>, when accessed with an Australian IP address, displays an English-language website using English ecommerce terminology and SENNHEISER product names, and that the Respondents are targeting multiple jurisdictions through country-specific domain names. The Complainant further submits that translation of the Complaint and its annexes into Chinese would cause unnecessary cost and delay.

The Respondents did not make any submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion 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 (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.5.1).

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.

6.2 Second Preliminary Issue: Consolidation of the Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.11.2.

The Panel has carefully reviewed all elements of this case, giving particular weight to the following elements and facts: (a) the disputed domain names all incorporate the Complainant's SENNHEISER trademark together with country or geographic terms, including "au", "canada", "chile", "colombia", "deutschland", "france", "india", "italia", "mexico", "nederland", "norge", "nz", "polska", "portugal", "romania", "southafrica", "suomi", "sverige", "turkiye", "uae", "espana", "ireland", and "magyarorszag"; (b) all the disputed domain names were registered on the same day, April 9, 2026; (c) at least three of the disputed domain names, namely <sennheiser-deutschland.com>, <sennheiser-sverige.com>, and <sennheiser-au.com> (when accessed with an Australian IP address), resolved to substantially similar SENNHEISER-branded online shops displaying the Complainant's SENNHEISER name and branding, product images, localized content and pricing, discount offers, and ecommerce functionality, while the remaining disputed domain names returned "406 Not Acceptable" responses; (d) the disputed domain names are associated with recurring technical configurations, including overlapping name servers and common IP ranges and hosting infrastructure; and (e) although the Respondents were duly notified of the proceeding and given an opportunity to respond, including to this request for consolidation, none of the Respondents submitted a Response or objected to the Complainant's request for consolidation.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

6.3 Findings on the Merits

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 a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of geographical or country terms, here, including "au", "canada", "chile", "colombia", "deutschland", "france", "india", "italia", "mexico", "nederland", "norge", "nz", "polska", "portugal", "romania", "southafrica", "suomi", "sverige", "turkiye", "uae", "espana", "ireland", and "magyarorszag", may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the SENNHEISER mark 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 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 notes that the Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its SENNHEISER trademark or to register any domain name incorporating that trademark. Further, there is no evidence that the Respondent is affiliated with the Complainant in any way, or that it has been commonly known by any of the disputed domain names within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. The Panel also finds that there is no evidence that the Respondent has used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Rather, based on the evidence, at least three of the disputed domain names were used to resolve to websites displaying the Complainant’s SENNHEISER trademark and branding, together with images of SENNHEISER products, localized content and currencies, discount offers, and ecommerce use, in a manner that falsely suggested an impersonation of, or at least an affiliation with the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, including copycat websites and passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

As to the remaining disputed domain names, the evidence shows that those disputed domain names directed to inactive or error websites. The Panel finds that holding the disputed domain names passively, without making any active use of them, also does not confer any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names on the Respondent in the circumstances of this case (see in this regard earlier UDRP decisions such as *Bollere SE v. 赵竹飞 (Zhao Zhu Fei)*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-0691](#); and *Vente-Privee.Com and Vente-Privee.com IP S.à.r.l. v. 崔郡 (jun cui)*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1685](#)).

The Panel further notes that the composition of the disputed domain names, combining the Complainant’s SENNHEISER trademark with geographical terms, including “au”, “canada”, “chile”, “colombia”, “deutschland”, “france”, “india”, “italia”, “mexico”, “nederland”, “norge”, “nz”, “polska”, “portugal”, “romania”, “southafrica”, “suomi”, “sverige”, “turkiye”, “uae”, “espana”, “ireland”, and “magyarország”, carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant by suggesting that the disputed domain names identify the official Complainant websites or national or regional sales websites for these respective jurisdictions. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

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.

In the present case, the Panel finds that, on the balance of probabilities, the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with knowledge of the Complainant and its SENNHEISER trademark. The trademark had been registered and used for many years before the registration of the disputed domain names, and the evidence indicates that SENNHEISER has a longstanding, strong international reputation. The Panel also considers that such evidence and the earlier recognitions of this mark as a well-known mark (see prior case under the Policy referred to above) support a finding that the Complainant's SENNHEISER trademark was well-known internationally at the time the disputed domain names were registered, thereby supporting an inference of bad faith registration on the part of the Respondent. This conclusion is further reinforced by the Respondent's subsequent use of the disputed domain names <sennheiser-deutschland.com>, <sennheiser-sverige.com>, and <sennheiser-au.com>, which displayed SENNHEISER branding, product images, localized content, and ecommerce use, clearly confirming that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's business and trademarks. In these circumstances, the Panel accepts that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark when registering the disputed domain names and targeted such mark by the registration of the disputed domain names.

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 finds that the Respondent has used at least three of the disputed domain names, namely <sennheiser-deutschland.com>, <sennheiser-sverige.com>, and <sennheiser-au.com> to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the associated websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's SENNHEISER trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites and the products purportedly offered on them. Those websites displayed the Complainant's SENNHEISER branding and product images, together with localized content, pricing, discount offers, and ecommerce functionality corresponding to the geographical terms incorporated in the respective disputed domain names. In the circumstances of the case, the Panel finds that such conduct falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy and constitutes direct evidence of use in bad faith. In addition, panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, including passing off, constitutes evidence of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

As to those of the disputed domain names that resolve (now and/ or in the past) to inactive or error websites, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) 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, the composition of the disputed domain name, and the unlikelihood of bona fide use, 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 disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith, and 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 <sennheiser-au.com>, <sennheiser-canada.com>, <sennheiser-chile.com>, <sennheiser-colombia.com>, <sennheiser-deutschland.com>, <sennheiserespana.com>, <sennheiser-france.com>, <sennheiser-india.com>, <sennheiserireland.com>, <sennheiser-italia.com>, <sennheisermagyarorszag.com>, <sennheiser-mexico.com>, <sennheiser-nederland.com>, <sennheiser-norge.com>, <sennheiser-nz.com>, <sennheiser-polska.com>, <sennheiser-portugal.com>, <sennheiser-

romania.com>, <sennheiser-southafrica.com>, <sennheiser-suomi.com>, <sennheiser-sverige.com>, <sennheiser-turkiye.com>, and <sennheiser-uae.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Deanna Wong Wai Man/

Deanna Wong Wai Man

Sole Panelist

Date: August 19, 2026