ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Bayer AG v. Kieran Miller
Case No. D2026-4128

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Bayer AG, Germany, represented by pm.legal, Germany.

The Respondent is Kieran Miller, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bayer-de.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 15, 2026. On September 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 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 (Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld For Privacy LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 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 amendment to the Complaint on September 18, 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 September 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 16, 2026.

The Center appointed Catherine Slater as the sole panelist in this matter on October 23, 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 global enterprise with interests in healthcare, nutrition and plant protection and which has its headquarters in Leverkusen, Germany. The Complainant's stock is included in major share indices, traded on all German stock exchanges and included in the DAX 40, a Blue-Chip stock market index consisting of the 40 major German companies trading on the Frankfurt Stock Exchange.

The Complainant has more than 89,000 employees worldwide and does business in 80 countries on all five continents. It manufactures and sells products including human pharmaceutical and medical care products, diagnostic products and agricultural chemicals.

The Complainant owns the following trademark registrations:-

- International Trademark No. 1462909 for BAYER (plain word) registered on November 28, 2018; and
- International Trademark No. 1476082 for BAYER (plain word) registered on December 10, 2018.

The Complainant operates websites located at domain names including <bayer.com> and <bayer.de>.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 19, 2026.

On September 12, 2026, and at the date of this decision, the disputed domain name did not resolve to any active website.

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 BAYER trade mark because it consists of that trademark together with the term "de" which is the ISO code for Germany where the Complainant is located. The Complainant further contends that such combination of terms will confuse Internet users as referring to the Complainant's domain name <bayer.de>.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because the Complainant has not licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its trademark or to apply for any domain name incorporating its trademark, there is no evidence of the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name (or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name) in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services and there is no evidence that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name or that it is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith because it is inconceivable that the Respondent registered it being unaware of the Complainant or its rights in the highly distinctive and well-known BAYER trademark which is demonstrated by the targeting of the Complainant's domain name <bayer.de> and the disputed domain could not be legitimately chosen except to create an impression of an association with the Complainant. The Complainant further contends that the passive

holding of the disputed domain name does not preclude a finding of bad faith use and in this regard relies on the Complainant's trademark being highly distinctive and well-established, the targeting of the Complainant, the Respondent's failure to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use and that there is no conceivable good faith use for the disputed domain name. The Complainant further contends that the registration prevents the Complainant reflecting its trademark in a corresponding domain name, the use of the disputed domain name by an entity with no connection to the Complainant demonstrates opportunistic bad faith, the use of the disputed domain name is calculated to disrupt the Complainant's business by diverting Internet users from the Complainant's website and the registration constitutes an abusive threat hanging over the Complainant.

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, a hyphen and the letters "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 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.

The Panel finds that the Complainant's trademark is well-known. Taking this fact into account together with the fact that the disputed domain name reproduces the trademark nearly identically with the addition of a geographic term and that the Respondent has provided no explanation for its selection of the disputed domain name, the Panel infers that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant's trademark in mind, and with the intention of profiting from, or otherwise exploiting, the goodwill attaching to that trademark.

The Panel finds the disputed domain name to be inherently misleading, as inevitably suggesting to Internet users that it is affiliated in some manner with the Complainant. While the Respondent's ultimate intention with regard to the disputed domain name is not known, the Panel can conceive of no use that the Respondent could make of the disputed domain name without causing confusion with the Complainant's trademark and taking unfair advantage of, and/or causing unfair detriment to, that trademark.

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. 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 reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, the failure of the Respondent to submit a response or provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use and indeed the implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain name could be put, and finds that in the circumstances of this case, the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of 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 <bayer-de.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Catherine Slater/
Catherine Slater
Sole Panelist
Date: November 6, 2026