

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Conrad Electronic SE v. jinli song  
Case No. D2026-3257

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Conrad Electronic SE, Germany, represented by BRP Renaud und Partner mbB, Germany.

The Respondent is jinli song, China.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <voltcraftde.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 23, 2026. On July 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 25, 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 (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 amendment to the Complaint on July 29, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 19, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Halvor Manshaus 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, Conrad Electronic SE, is a German company (Societas Europaea) based in Hirschau, Germany, engaged in the manufacture and sale of measuring instruments and charging technology under the “VOLTCRAFT” brand, which it markets as having been in use for over 20 years.

The Complainant relies on the following trademark registrations for VOLTCRAFT:

- German trademark Registration No. 1037154, VOLTCRAFT, filed February 19, 1982, and registered August 18, 1982, in class 9, currently held by the Complainant;
- International registration No. 583992, VOLTCRAFT, registered February 21, 1992, in class 9, held by the Complainant, designating (among others) Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Benelux, Switzerland, China, France, Croatia, Hungary, Italy, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Poland, Portugal, and Serbia; and
- European Union Trademark registration No. 000446088, VOLTCRAFT, registered May 26, 1999, in classes 7, 9, and 11, originally registered to Conrad Electronic GmbH and now held by the Complainant.

The Complainant also holds a further European Union Trademark registration for VOLTCRAFT (figurative, No. 003248325, registered January 5, 2005, in classes 7, 9, and 11).

The disputed domain name was created on August 4, 2024, well after the Complainant’s trademark registrations. According to the Complaint, as of July 23, 2026, the disputed domain name resolved to a website in German, presenting itself as “Voltcraft® Multimeter, Ladegerät, Multitester Hersteller Deutschland – Offizielle Website,” using the VOLTCRAFT mark and branding and offering test equipment, chargers, multimeters, and current clamps, with a listed contact address of [...], Düsseldorf, and a support email at “[...]@voltcraftde.com”.

At the time the Complaint was filed, the registrant of the disputed domain name was concealed by a privacy service provided by the Registrar. Following Registrar verification, the underlying registrant was disclosed as jinli song, of China.

The Complainant has confirmed it has no relationship with, or knowledge of, the Respondent, and has never authorized the Respondent to use the VOLTCRAFT mark. The Complainant states that it filed abuse notices with the Registrar and takedown notices to hosting providers, but the disputed domain name has remained active.

#### 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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its VOLTCRAFT trademarks, as it reproduces the mark in its entirety together with the geographic term “de”, the recognized abbreviation and country code for Germany, and argues that this addition reinforces rather than dispels confusion by falsely suggesting a German branch or authorized local outlet of the Complainant.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, asserting that it has never authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the VOLTCRAFT mark or to register any domain name incorporating it, that there is no business relationship of any kind between the Parties, that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent instead uses the disputed domain name to operate a website that impersonates the Complainant and reproduces its VOLTCRAFT branding to deceive Internet users.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It argues that its VOLT CRAFT mark is well known and has been used extensively in Europe for over 20 years, predating the registration of the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's rights when registering a domain name reproducing the mark in its entirety together with the country code for Germany, the Complainant's primary market. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to intentionally attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement, aggravated by the addition of the "de" element suggesting an official German site.

The Complainant also points to the Respondent's use of a privacy service to conceal its identity, its failure to respond to abuse notices, and its practice of changing hosting providers to keep the disputed domain name active, as further indicia of 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 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 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 name. Accordingly, the disputed 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, the country-code abbreviation "de", 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 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 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 Panel notes that the Respondent is not affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant to use its trademark, nor is there any evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. Further, the Panel notes that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant's mark in its entirety together with the country-code element "de" to operate a website that reproduces the Complainant's VOLT CRAFT mark and branding and holds itself out as an official German source for VOLT CRAFT products. Such use does not confer any rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed as applicable to this case: copycat site or passing off – i.e., establishing a website that reproduces the Complainant's mark and branding and holds itself out as the Complainant's official German site – can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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 notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, which reproduces the Complainant's distinctive VOLT CRAFT mark in its entirety together with the country-code element "de" decades after the Complainant's trademark rights were established, and has used it to operate a website that reproduces the Complainant's VOLT CRAFT mark and branding and German-language content and holds itself out as the Complainant's official German site. The Panel finds this constitutes an intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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 further notes that the Respondent's use of a privacy service to conceal its identity, its failure to respond to abuse notices and the Complaint, and its practice of changing hosting providers to keep the disputed domain name active support an inference of bad faith in the overall circumstances of this case.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed as copycat site and passing off, 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 <voltcraftde.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Halvor Manshaus/*

**Halvor Manshaus**

Sole Panelist

Date: September 8, 2026