

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Osram GmbH v. Mani Usman
Case No. D2026-3661

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Mani Usman, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <osraminternational.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 14, 2026. On August 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 17, 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 (Registration Private / Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 18, 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 August 20, 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 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 10, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 14, 2026.

The Center appointed Mehmet Polat Kalafatoglu as the sole panelist in this matter on September 16, 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 manufacturer of photonics and lighting technology. The brand OSRAM was created in 1906, and the company was formally established in 1919. Today, the ams OSRAM group operates with approximately 18,500 employees worldwide.

The Complainant submits that it is the owner of more than 250 registrations and pending applications of the word mark OSRAM alone, including the following:

- The United States of America trademark registration No. 1552573 for OSRAM, registered on August 22, 1989;
- The European Union trademark registration No. 000027490 for OSRAM, registered on April 17, 1998; and
- The Pakistan (where the Respondent is located) trademark registration No. 4577 for OSRAM, registered on April 7, 1949.

The Complainant submits that it owns countless domain name registrations containing the OSRAM trademark, including <osram.com>, <osram.de>, and <osram.pk>.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 23, 2024. Before the filing of the Complaint, it was resolving to a website, that offered various products under different brands, including the brand OSRAM with a design element. The website was also displaying a logo combining the words “Osram” and “International” with a design element. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name points to a website that displays an error message.

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. The Complainant's contentions are summarized below.

First, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name fully incorporates the well-known OSRAM trademark and is confusingly similar to it.

Second, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. In this regard, the Complainant, inter alia, states that the OSRAM trademark is well-known and obviously connected with the Complainant and its products. “Osram” is not a word any market participant or other domain registrant would legitimately choose unless seeking to create an impression of association with the Complainant. The Complainant has not licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use any of its trademarks and has not permitted the Respondent to apply for or use any domain name incorporating the OSRAM trademark. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to offer various products under several trademarks, including OSRAM. The Respondent's logos used on the website clearly imitate the Complainant's well-known logo and the Respondent's products include glue, which falls within Class 1, as registered in favor of the Complainant. The Respondent's use constitutes a clear case of trademark infringement. There is also no evidence that suggests that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name or is commonly known by the disputed domain name or the name “Osram International”. The Complainant submits that it was not able to trace a

corresponding trademark application or registration, has no further information on the Respondent's identity, and a check on the official Pakistani company search for "Osram International" was unsuccessful.

Third, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In this regard, the Complainant claims that "Osram" is obviously not a word a domain name registrant would legitimately choose unless seeking to create an impression of an association with the Complainant. Based on the Complainant's high profile worldwide and the fact that the Respondent deliberately targets the Complainant by using the Complainant's logo on its website and by offering similar products, it is inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name unaware of the Complainant and its trademark. The Complainant also submits that the Respondent's purpose is, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's well-known OSRAM trademark, to divert traffic intended for the Complainant's website to its own.

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, "international", 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. In this regard, the Panel first notes the Complainant's assertions that it has not licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use its OSRAM trademark and to register any domain names incorporating the same trademark. The Panel also notes the Complainant's un rebutted assertion that a check on the official Pakistani company search for "Osram International" was unsuccessful. Nothing in the available record suggests that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

In particular, the Respondent has failed to provide any persuasive explanation of its choice of the disputed domain name and its previous use, and it has not presented any other evidence of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Panel considers the composition of the disputed domain name (which fully reproduces the Complainant's distinctive and decades-long trademark with the addition of the term "international") and the confusingly similar logos displayed at the Respondent's website and on some of the products offered by the Respondent prior to the filing of the Complaint. First, in the Panel's view, this composition and previous use of the disputed domain name create a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant, as it suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant of the Respondent's website and/or products sold on that website. This cannot constitute fair use under the Policy. Second, the Panel finds that the previous use of the disputed domain name described above also suggests that the Respondent intended to take unfair advantage of the Complainant and the OSRAM trademark's reputation to promote its website and products. The fact that the disputed domain name currently resolves to an inactive website does not alter the Panel's conclusions under this element.

By failing to submit a Response, 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.

Based on the available record, 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.

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.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

With regard to the registration in bad faith, the Panel considers the following: the OSRAM trademark is also protected in Pakistan, where the Respondent is located; the disputed domain name was registered around 75 years after the Complainant registered its OSRAM trademark in the Respondent's location; the disputed domain name fully incorporates the Complainant's trademark with the addition of the term "international"; the previous use of the disputed domain name explained below (in particular, the confusingly similar logos displayed at the said website and on some of the products offered by the Respondent); and, the Respondent's failure to provide any explanation for its choice of the disputed domain name. Under these circumstances, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name with the intention of taking unfair advantage of the Complainant's trademark.

Considering the previous use of the disputed domain name explained above, the Panel finds that the Respondent, by using the disputed domain name, has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the OSRAM trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or of some of the products offered on its website. The current inactive use of the disputed domain name does not alter the Panel's determination under this element.

Based on the available record, 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 <osraminternational.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mehmet Polat Kalafatoglu/

Mehmet Polat Kalafatoglu

Sole Panelist

Date: September 30, 2026