

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Frankfurter Bankgesellschaft Gruppe v. Chan Mei Kuin Eve Junie, quanterix
Case No. D2026-3930

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Frankfurter Bankgesellschaft Gruppe, Switzerland, represented by Ubilibet, S.L., Spain.

The Respondent is Chan Mei Kuin Eve Junie, quanterix, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <frankfurter-bankgesellschaft.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 September 2, 2026. On September 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 3, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 3, 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 September 7, 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 September 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 28, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Peter Burgstaller as the sole panelist in this matter on October 9, 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 private banking institution, headquartered in Zurich, Switzerland, and with roots in Frankfurt, Germany; the Complainant forms part of the Sparkassen-Finanzgruppe, one of Europe's largest financial networks (Annex 4 to the Complaint).

The Complainant owns trademark registrations containing the mark FRANKFURTER BANKGESELLSCHAFT AG in several jurisdictions, inter alia

- European Union registration for FRANKFURTER BANKGESELLSCHAFT AG (word), Reg. No. 001257161, registered on October 19, 2000;
- German registration for FRANKFURTER BANKGESELLSCHAFT AG (word), Reg. No. 398623198, registered on October 19, 2000;
- United Kingdom registration for FRANKFURTER BANKGESELLSCHAFT AG (word), Reg. No. UK00901257161, registered on October 19, 2000 (Panelist's own research).

The Complainant addresses its main business website under the domain name <frankfurter-bankgesellschaft.com> (Panelist's own research).

The disputed domain name was registered on March 21, 2026 (Annex 1 to the Complaint). The disputed domain name was used as a part of an email-address to impersonate an employee of the Complainant (Annex 5 to the Complaint). The disputed domain name does not resolve to a website with material content.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the FRANKFURTER BANKGESELLSCHAFT trademark is highly distinctive, well known and has a strong reputation; it notes that the disputed domain name contains the FRANKFURTER BANKGESELLSCHAFT trademark in its entirety, only contains a typo in the word "bankgsellschaft" instead of "bankgesellschaft" which cannot eliminate the identity between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name.

The Complainant submits that especially because of the fame of the Complainant and its trademark, it is inconceivable that the Respondent would not have been aware of the Complainant's trademark when registering the disputed domain name, or that there would be any legitimate use for the disputed domain name. Further, the Complainant has never assigned, granted, licensed, sold, transferred or in any way authorized the Respondent to use the FRANKFURTER BANKGESELLSCHAFT trademark in any manner.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting its business by creating a likelihood of confusion among users and consumers, giving the false impression of an association or connection to the Complainant. The Complainant notes that the disputed domain name was already used for phishing activities – an email was sent from the disputed domain name, impersonating the Complainant's workers.

Further, the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith – the Complainant alleges that this is the case here.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of the mark FRANKFURTER BANKGESELLSCHAFT AG for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

In the present case, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark FRANKFURTER BANKGESELLSCHAFT AG in which the Complainant has rights since it incorporates the entirety of the mark and only adds a hyphen between the two words "frankfurter" and "bankgesellschaft" and omits the letter "e" in the word "bankgesellschaft" which is a common, obvious and intentional misspelling of the Complainant's trademark and omits the corporate identifier "AG". The disputed domain name may therefore be considered to be confusingly similar to the FRANKFURTER BANKGESELLSCHAFT AG mark of the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

Finally, it has also long been held that generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") (in this case ".com") are generally disregarded when evaluating the confusing similarity of a disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, 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.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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 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, since it has never assigned, granted, licensed, sold, transferred or in any way authorized the Respondent to register or use the FRANKFURTER BANKGESELLSCHAFT AG trademark in any manner. The Respondent did not reply and hence has not rebutted the Complainant's contentions.

Further, the composition of the disputed domain name (misspelling of the Complainant's mark), coupled with the use of the disputed domain name to send emails in the name of the Complainant's employees affirms the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likely confusion with the Complainant and its trademark.

Finally, panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (e.g., phishing) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1. In the present case, the Complainant has shown that the disputed domain name was used for phishing activities.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

As stated in many decisions rendered under the Policy (e.g., *Robert Ellenbogen v. Mike Pearson*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0001](#)) both conditions, registration and use in bad faith, must be demonstrated; consequently, the Complainant must show that:

- the disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent in bad faith, and
- the disputed domain name is being used by the Respondent in bad faith.

(i) In the present case, the Complainant provided evidence which demonstrates rights in the distinctive trademark FRANKFURTER BANKGESELLSCHAFT AG, registered and used in many jurisdictions before the disputed domain name was registered. The Complainant further uses the domain name <frankfurter-bankgesellschaft.com> for its main business website.

It is therefore inconceivable for this Panel that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its rights in the mark FRANKFURTER BANKGESELLSCHAFT AG, which leads to the necessary inference of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

This finding is supported by the fact that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark entirely and merely adds a hyphen between the two words together with a common and obvious misspelling of the Complainant's trademark.

Therefore, the Panel is convinced that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith by the Respondent.

(ii) The Complainant has put forward evidence that the disputed domain name was used for phishing activities. As noted above, given that the use of a domain name for per se illegitimate activity such as phishing can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent, such behavior is manifestly considered evidence of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4 and 3.4. Moreover, the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos) to a widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith.

The evidence and documents produced and put forward by the Complainant together with the fact that the Respondent has failed to file a Response and therefore failed to present any evidence of any good faith

registration and use with regard to the disputed domain name further indicate that the disputed domain name was registered and is used by the Respondent in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <frankfurter-bankgesellschaft.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Peter Burgstaller/

Peter Burgstaller

Sole Panelist

Date: October 17, 2026