

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sennheiser electronic SE & Co. KG v. kevin perez, Lily Murphy, Zoey Rivera, Babu Jeff, Joe Watts, Michael Martinez, Christopher Ramirez, Dennis Wilson, Ethan Hamilton, Elina Dawkins, Dennis Thomas and Karl Blom
Case No. D2026-2997

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are kevin perez, Lily Murphy, Zoey Rivera, Babu Jeff, Joe Watts, Michael Martinez, Christopher Ramirez, Dennis Wilson, Ethan Hamilton, Elina Dawkins, Dennis Thomas and Karl Blom, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <buysennheiserhearing.shop>, <getsennheiserhearing.shop>, <mysennheiser.shop>, <mysennheiserhearing.shop>, <sennheisergear.shop>, <sennheiserglobal.shop>, <sennheiserhearing.shop>, <sennheiserhearingstore.shop>, <sennheisermexico.shop>, <sennheiseronline.shop>, <sennheiserpremium.shop>, <sennheiserselect.shop> and <sennheisertech.shop> are registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 8, 2026. On July 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 9, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrants and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent 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 Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints 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 on July 19, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 16, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on August 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Uwa Ohiku as the sole panelist in this matter on August 25, 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 an international company, with roots going back to 1945. It specializes in the design and production of a variety of audio products. It has more than 2,800 employees, three manufacturing sites (in Germany, Ireland, and the United States), as well as sales subsidiaries and research laboratories worldwide.

The Complainant owns several registrations worldwide, for the trademark SENNHEISER, including the following: International trademark registration No. 670839, registered on March 6, 1997; European Union Trade Mark No. 000370122, registered on August 27, 1999, and European Union Trade Mark No. 001594308 registered on August 21, 2001.

The Complainant also owns several domain names featuring the SENNHEISER trademark, including the domain name <sennheiser.com>, registered on April 24, 1999, which hosts the Complainant’s main website. The Complainant’s social media presence – Instagram, X, YouTube, Facebook – also features the mark.

The Respondents are identified as various individuals in the United States.

The disputed domain names were registered on the dates and in the names shown in the table below:

Date of registration	Disputed domain name	Name of registrant
April 9, 2026	<buysennheiserhearing.shop>	kevin perez
April 9, 2026	<sennheiserhearing.shop>	kevin perez
April 14, 2026	<sennheisertech.shop>	Lily Murphy
April 16, 2026	<mysisennheiserhearing.shop>	Zoey Rivera
April 20, 2026	<sennheiseronline.shop>	Babu Jeff
May 25, 2026	<getsennheiserhearing.shop>	Michael Martinez
May 26, 2026	<sennheiserglobal.shop>	Joe Watts
May 27, 2026	<sennheisergear.shop>	Ethan Hamilton
May 27, 2026	<sennheiserpremium.shop>	Dennis Wilson
June 4, 2026	<sennheiserselect.shop>	Elina Dawkins
June 4, 2026	<sennheiserhearingstore.shop>	Dennis Thomas
June 5, 2026	<mysennheiser.shop>	Christopher Ramirez
June 21, 2026	<sennheisermexico.shop>	Karl Blom

According to evidence submitted at the time of the Complaint, all the disputed domain names, with the exception of <mysisennheiserhearing.shop>, resolved to commercial websites with identical banner images and product presentations which suggest official “Sennheiser” websites and/or authorized dealers or online stores or product channels and offering for sale “Sennheiser-branded” audio products at discount prices. The present position is unchanged. The disputed domain name <mysisennheiserhearing.shop>, resolved to an inactive page at the time of the Complaint and remains unchanged.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied all the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names. The Complainant contends particularly as follows:

Identical or Confusingly Similar: that its rights in the trademark SENNHEISER predate the registration of the disputed domain names and that the entirety of the trademark is reproduced and recognizable within the disputed domain names, making the disputed domain names confusingly similar to the trademark.

No Rights or Legitimate Interests: that the Complainant has not licensed, authorized, permitted or otherwise consented to the Respondents’ registration or use of the disputed domain names or to any use of the SENNHEISER trademark, product names, product images, website layout or branding; that the Respondents are not authorized dealers, distributors, resellers, service providers or affiliates of the Complainant; that the Respondents are not named “Sennheiser” or commonly known by any of the disputed domain names or by a corresponding name such as “Sennheiser Hearing”, “My Sennheiser”, “Sennheiser Gear”, “Sennheiser Global”, or “Sennheiser Mexico”; that the disclosed names: Kevin Perez, Lily Murphy, Zoey Rivera, Babu Jeff, Joe Watts, Michael Martinez, Christopher Ramirez, Dennis Wilson, Ethan Hamilton, Elina Dawkins, Dennis Thomas and Karl Blom, bear no relationship whatsoever to the SENNHEISER mark or to the disputed domain names; that the Respondents’ use of the disputed domain names creates a false impression of an affiliation with the Complainant, by using the Complainant’s mark and product presentation, and soliciting consumer attention through discount offers and e-commerce functionalities; that the Respondents cannot rely on any “legitimate reseller” defense as the twelve disputed domain names falsely suggest official “Sennheiser” stores or product channels and the websites do not accurately and prominently disclose the absence of any relationship with the Complainant, but use the Complainant’s trademark and official-sounding brand presentation instead, to mislead consumers into believing that the twelve websites are operated or authorized by the Complainant or its licensees or distributors; that the use of a domain name for illegal activities, including impersonation, copycat sites, passing off, phishing, identity theft, sale of counterfeit goods, or other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests; that the “server - hold” status of the disputed domain name <mysisennheiserhearing.shop>, does not create rights or legitimate interests in the Respondent, as passive or suspended holding of a domain name composed of the SENNHEISER mark, in addition to the term “hearing”, cannot be legitimate, where the Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant, nor can establish independent rights in the mark SENNHEISER, and has no plausible justification for registering such disputed domain name, particularly where the surrounding evidence shows a coordinated fake-shop scheme.

Registered and Used in Bad Faith: that the Complainant’s mark SENNHEISER had been used and registered for decades and was already well-known internationally with a strong reputation, for audio products, headphones, microphones, soundbars and related accessories prior to the registration of the disputed domain names; that the Respondents selected the distinctive SENNHEISER mark in its entirety and combined it with terms that directly refer to the Complainant’s products, online retail, premium/select offerings, or national markets; that the nature of the disputed domain names leaves no plausible explanation other than that the Respondents were aware of, and intentionally targeted the Complainant; that the registration of thirteen “.shop” extension domain names incorporating the same well-known mark of the same complainant, within a short time frame, through the same registrar, with the same naming pattern, with common hosting evidence, amongst several other factors, demonstrates a deliberate pattern of abusive

registrations and an independent evidence of bad faith registration, and reinforces the inference that the Respondents had actual knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark SENNHEISER; that twelve of the disputed domain names are being used in bad faith, for fake online shops, and such use falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy; that by using the disputed domain names, the Respondents intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's SENNHEISER mark, as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites and the products purportedly offered on them; that the fake shops create an additional risk of consumer harm as Internet users may believe they are purchasing genuine "Sennheiser" products from authorized online stores and may provide personal data, delivery information, login details or payment information; that the use of a domain name for such deceptive e-commerce activities, copycat presentation, passing off, phishing or potential payment frauds, is manifest evidence of bad faith; that the websites printouts show a coordinated commercial impersonation scheme, displaying official-looking "Sennheiser" products and brand content, sales language, present product-card grids and shopping functionalities; that the fake shops also use substantial discount claims to attract consumers, such as "Up to 70% Off Selected Items Shop Sale", "New Discount Collection", "Final Sale Items", "Offers", and repeated product-level discount labels such as "65% OFF" and "70% OFF", which are not neutral price references, but part of the misleading commercial presentation designed to induce consumers to believe they are purchasing genuine "Sennheiser" products from an official or authorized online outlet, and to exploit the reputation in the Complainant's SENNHEISER trademark and mislead consumers for commercial gain; that the disputed domain name <mysisennheiserhearing.shop> which does not presently resolve to a visible shop is also being used in bad faith, under the passive holding doctrine that non-use or passive holding does not prevent a finding of bad faith where, considering all circumstances, the Respondent is targeting the Complainant's mark; that the relevant factors to be taken into consideration include the distinctiveness and reputation of the SENNHEISER mark, which had been registered decades before the disputed domain names were registered, the lack of any plausible good faith use, the same registrar, the same ".shop" extension, the common naming pattern, the recurring name-server configuration, and the use of the closely related domains for fake shops; that no good faith use of the disputed domain names is plausible, as each of the disputed domain names, apart from <mysisennheiserhearing.shop>, falsely suggests an official "Sennheiser" online shop, hearing-products store, national sales channel, or related consumer-audio outlet; that any use by the Respondents would likely mislead Internet users into believing there is an affiliation with the Complainant.

The Complainant supports its contentions with copious evidence comprising several annexes and references to previous UDRP panel decisions, including references to applicable provisions of the Rules, the Policy and the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), respectively.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Issues

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to twelve nominally different disputed domain name registrants, with two disputed domain names: <buysennheiserhearing.shop> and <sennheiserhearing.shop> registered in the same registrant's name: kevin perez. The Complainant alleges that the twelve 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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel considers the following, amongst other factors that: all the thirteen disputed domain names were registered within a relatively short period between April 9, 2026 and June 21, 2026; they were all registered with the same Registrar – Dynadot Inc; all registrants purport to be individuals located in the United States; the disputed domain names all follow a naming pattern incorporating the Complainant's SENNHEISER trademark entirely and include additional terms: "buy", "get", "my", "hearing", "store", "gear", "global", "premium", "select", "online", "tech", and "Mexico"; the disputed domain names all end with the same ".shop" Top-Level Domain ("TLD"); apart from the disputed domain name <mysisennheiserhearing.shop>, which resolves to an inactive page, they have near-identical use of the disputed domain names for Sennheiser-branded websites/online shops which use substantially similar promotional language. In the circumstances, the Panel finds it likely that all the disputed domain names are under common control.

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

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different registrants of the disputed domain names <buysennheiserhearing.shop>, <getsennheiserhearing.shop>, <mysennheiser.shop>, <mysisennheiserhearing.shop>, <sennheisergear.shop>, <sennheiserglobal.shop>, <sennheiserhearing.shop>, <sennheiserhearingstore.shop>, <sennheisermexico.shop>, <sennheiseronline.shop>, <sennheiserpremium.shop>, <sennheiserselect.shop> and <sennheisertech.shop> (hereafter referred to as "the Respondent") in this single proceeding.

6.2. Substantive Issues

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

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 Complainant's SENNHEISER mark is wholly incorporated and recognizable 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.

The addition of the terms "buy", "get", "my", "hearing", "store", "gear", "global", "premium", "select", "online", "si", "tech", and "mexico" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Complainant's mark SENNHEISER for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. Further, the ".shop" extension is disregarded when assessing confusing similarity, being a standard registration requirement.

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. Where a complainant therefore makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of providing relevant evidence to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the domain name shifts to the respondent, 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 and the preponderance of the evidence provided, 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 or come forward to demonstrate its rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names as enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Twelve of the thirteen disputed domain names actively resolve to websites impersonating the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, as applicable to this case: copycat sites, passing off, or other types of fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1. The disputed domain name <mysisennheiserhearing.shop> resolves to an inactive page. These circumstances do not support any bona fide offering of goods and services on the part of the Respondent or that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names for the purposes of the Policy.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used 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 making this assessment as well. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The Panel has considered the assertions made by the Complainant and the evidence provided in support thereof, including the evidence of the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain names, all of which are unrebutted by the Respondent. The Complainant’s mark SENNHEISER has been registered in several jurisdictions around the world and has been used by the Complainant and gained a reputation in relation to audio products. Further, the Complainant’s mark SENNHEISER predates all the disputed domain names. The inherently misleading disputed domain names comprise the SENNHEISER mark entirely, with the addition of the terms “buy”, “get”, “my”, “si”, “hearing”, “store”, “gear”, “global”, “premium”, “select”, “online”, “tech”, and “mexico”, and the “.shop” extension, all of which, in the Panel’s view, further support a finding of bad faith on the part of the Respondent, given the products and the business of the Complainant.

Given the widespread registration and use of the Complainant’s mark SENNHEISER and taking all the circumstances of this case into consideration, the Panel concludes that it is highly unlikely that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant and its SENNHEISER mark when the Respondent registered the disputed domain names. Rather, the Panel is of the view that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and its mark when it registered the disputed domain names and intentionally targeted the Complainant’s mark to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the websites associated with the disputed domain names, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites.

In relation to disputed domain name <mysisennheiserhearing.shop>, which resolves to an inactive page, Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. On 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 and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name <mysisennheiserhearing.shop>, and finds that in the circumstances of this case, its passive holding does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity as applicable to this case: copycat sites, passing off, or other types of fraud constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Taking all the foregoing into account, and the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy and that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used by the Respondent in bad faith.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraph 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain names <buysennheiserhearing.shop>, <getsennheiserhearing.shop>, <mysennheiser.shop>, <mysisennheiserhearing.shop>, <sennheisergear.shop>, <sennheiserglobal.shop>, <sennheiserhearing.shop>, <sennheiserhearingstore.shop>, <sennheisermexico.shop>, <sennheiseronline.shop>, <sennheiserpremium.shop>, <sennheiserselect.shop> and <sennheisertech.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Uwa Ohiku/

Uwa Ohiku

Sole Panelist

Date: September 3, 2026