

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ralf Bohle GmbH v. HoweJuanita

Case No. D2026-3134

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Ralf Bohle GmbH, Germany, represented by MSA IP - Milojevic Sekulic & Associates, Serbia.

The Respondent is HoweJuanita, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <schwalbe-rabatt.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Metaregistrar BV (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 16, 2026. On July 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On July 20, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 28, 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 July 29, 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 August 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 27, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 3, 2026.

The Center appointed Nicholas Smith as the sole panelist in this matter on September 10, 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 German company, established in 1922, which since 1973 has manufactured and sold a variety of bicycle tyres under the SCHWALBE brand. The Complainant currently sells its tire products in over 40 countries.

The Complainant holds trademark registrations for the word SCHWALBE ("SCHWALBE Mark") in various jurisdictions including an European Union ("EU") trademark registration which it has held since 2012 (Registration No. 011061322, registered December 18, 2012, for goods and services in classes 8, 9 and 12).

The Domain Name was registered on May 26, 2026. The Domain Name is presently inactive but prior to the commencement of the proceeding resolved to a website (the "Respondent's Website") that purported to offer bicycle tires and related products under the Complainant's SCHWALBE Mark and related logo. The products offered on the Respondent's Website were offered at heavily discounted prices, relative to the price charged by the Complainant for its legitimate SCHWALBE products.

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 Domain Name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

- a) It is the owner of the SCHWALBE Mark, having registered the SCHWALBE Mark in various jurisdictions including the EU and Germany. The Domain Name is confusingly similar to the SCHWALBE Mark as it merely adds the descriptive term "rabatt" (meaning "discount" in German) and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" to the mark.
- b) There are no rights or legitimate interests held by the Respondent in respect of the Domain Name. The Complainant has not granted any license or authorization for the Respondent to use the SCHWALBE Mark. The Respondent is not commonly known by the SCHWALBE Mark, nor does it use the Domain Name for a bona fide purpose or legitimate noncommercial purpose. Rather the Respondent is using the Domain Name to pass off as the Complainant for commercial gain by reproducing the Complainant's mark and logo and purporting to offer either counterfeit or competing versions of the Complainant's goods. Such use is not a legitimate use of the Domain Name.
- c) The Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent is using the Domain Name to divert Internet users searching for the Complainant to the Respondent's Website to disrupt the Complainant's business and for commercial gain. Such conduct amounts to registration and use of the Domain Name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

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 Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[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 Domain Name. Accordingly, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here "rabatt" ("discount" in German) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the 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 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 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 Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel considers that the record of this case reflects that:

- before any notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the Respondent did not use, nor has it made demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.2;

- the Respondent (as an individual, business, or other organization) has not been commonly known by the Domain Name. Paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.3;

- the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue. Paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.4; and

- the record contains no other factors demonstrating rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the Domain Name.

The Respondent has used the Domain Name to operate a website to sell bike tires and related products that purport to be legitimate SCHWALBE products. It is unclear whether the products sold are counterfeit or genuine products produced by the Complainant although the Complainant submits that, given the steeply discounted prices offered on the Respondent's Website, the products offered are unlikely to be genuine. If the bike tires sold on the Respondent's Website are not genuine products produced by the Complainant, the Respondent's use of the Domain Name does not grant it rights or legitimate interests since it is using the Complainant's SCHWALBE Mark for a website selling counterfeit products.

Even if the Respondent is offering genuine SCHWALBE products from the Respondent's Website, such use does not automatically grant it rights or legitimate interests. The principles that govern whether a reseller of genuine goods has rights or legitimate interests have been set out in a variety of UDRP decisions, starting with the case of *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#) ("Oki Data test").

The [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8.1 summarizes the consensus views of UDRP panels in assessing claims of nominative (fair) use by resellers or distributors in the following manner:

"... Panels have recognized that resellers, distributors, or service providers using a domain name containing the complainant's trademark to undertake sales or repairs related to the complainant's goods or services may be making a bona fide offering of goods and services and thus have a legitimate interest in such domain name. Outlined in the 'Oki Data test', the following cumulative requirements will be applied in the specific conditions of a UDRP case:

- (i) the respondent must actually be offering the goods or services at issue;
- (ii) the respondent must use the site to sell only the trademarked goods or services;
- (iii) the site must accurately and prominently disclose the registrant's relationship with the trademark holder; and
- (iv) the respondent must not try to 'corner the market' in domain names that reflect the trademark.

The 'Oki Data test' does not apply where any prior agreement, express or otherwise, between the parties expressly prohibits (or allows) the registration or use of domain names incorporating the complainant's trademark."

In this case, the Respondent's Website does not accurately or prominently disclose the Respondent's relationship with the Complainant, in particular that it is not an authorized dealer or has any particular connection with the Complainant. Rather, the absence of a disclaimer and the prominent use of the Complainant's logo in the heading of the Respondent's Website may result in the impression that the Respondent's Website is an official website of the Complainant or an authorized reseller. In the circumstances of this case, even in the event that the Respondent is reselling genuine SCHWALBE products, its use of the Domain Name for the Respondent's Website does not grant it rights or legitimate interests in the 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 Panel finds that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its reputation in the SCHWALBE Mark at the time the Respondent registered the Domain Name. The Respondent has provided no explanation, and neither is it immediately obvious, why an entity would register a domain name that wholly incorporates the SCHWALBE Mark and direct it to a website purportedly offering bike tires under the Complainant's SCHWALBE Mark (non-complying with the requirements of the Oki Data test) unless there was an awareness of and an intention to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its SCHWALBE Mark. Furthermore, as discussed earlier in the Decision, the Respondent's Website reproduces the Complainant's logo, further indicating an awareness of the Complainant. The registration of the Domain Name in awareness of the SCHWALBE Mark and in the absence of rights or legitimate interests amounts under these circumstances to registration in bad faith.

The Panel considers that the record of this case reflects that the Respondent has passed off as the Complainant and purported to offer bike tires, be they genuine or otherwise, under the Complainant's SCHWALBE Mark on the Respondent's Website without the Complainant's approval and without meeting the Oki Data test. The Panel finds that the Respondent is using the Domain Name in bad faith to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the SCHWALBE Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's Website. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

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 Domain Name <schwalbe-rabatt.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nicholas Smith/

Nicholas Smith

Sole Panelist

Date: September 14, 2026