ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
CSL Behring LLC v. Mark Oppenheim, csl-behring
Case No. D2026-4612

1. The Parties

The Complainant is CSL Behring LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by BEST Rechtsanwälte, Germany.

The Respondent is Mark Oppenheim, csl-behring, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <csl-behring.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 12, 2026. On October 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 13, 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 October 14, 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 October 14, 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 October 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on November 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Gregory N. Albright as the sole panelist in this matter on November 5, 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.

On November 5, 2026, the Panel issued Administrative Panel Procedural Order No. 1, requesting further information from the Complainant regarding alleged fraudulent use of email addresses associated with the disputed domain name. The Complainant was asked to respond by November 7, 2026, and did so. The Respondent was invited to comment on the Complainant's submission by November 9, 2026, but did not respond.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a global biotechnology company with a particular focus on plasma-derived and recombinant therapies for the treatment of rare and serious diseases, such as coagulation disorders, immunodeficiencies, chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy, hereditary angioedema, and alpha-1 antitrypsin deficiency.

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registrations for the CSL BEHRING mark: (1) European Union Trade Mark ("EUTM") No. 018128369, issued June 13, 2022; and (2) Swiss trademark No. 751449, issued August 31, 2020.

The Complainant maintains websites at "www.cslbehring.de" and "www.csl.com".

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on March 5, 2026. It is not used for the operation of a website but only for email addresses impersonating the Complainant's employees for the purposes of employment-related spam and phishing in at least the United States.

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.

First, the Complainant asserts that it is the owner of trademark rights in the CSL BEHRING mark, and the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to this mark.

Second, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; specifically, before notice of the dispute the Respondent did not use, or make demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name; and the Respondent is not making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Instead, as noted above in Section 4, the Respondent is using an email associated with the disputed domain name for spam and phishing.

Third, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith; specifically: the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in order to prevent the Complainant from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name; and the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or other online location.

In support of its arguments for bad faith, the Complaint asserts that since August 2026 the Complainant was repeatedly approached by individuals in the United States who were contacted through email addresses such as "[…]@csl-behring.com." The Complainant received reports that these emails were attempts to receive personal data by creating the false impression that the emails originated from the Complainant's human resources or recruitment departments.

In response to Procedural Order No. 1, the Complainant provided additional detail. In August 2026, the Complainant received an inquiry from a third party about an individual using an email address associated with the disputed domain name. The sender wanted to make sure the email was legitimate since it was initially marked spam and differed from the Complainant's corporate domain name. A representative of the Complainant responded by stating awareness of a number of employment-related spam and phishing emails that appear to be impersonating the Complainant.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions in the Complaint, or the additional information the Complainant provided in response to Procedural Order No. 1.

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 CSL BEHRING mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, adding only a hyphen between "csl" and "behring". Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7. The addition of the hyphen 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 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity – here, claimed phishing or other types of fraud – 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.

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.

Here, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in March 2026, years after the Complainant obtained trademark registrations for the CSL BEHRING mark. In addition, the disputed domain name is nearly identical to the Complainant's CSL BEHRING mark, and the addition of a hyphen between "csl" and "behring" does not diminish the confusing similarity. These facts support the conclusion that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith for the purposes of creating a false association with the Complainant.

With respect to bad faith use, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for fraudulent activity, like the phishing or other types of fraud at issue here, constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. The Respondent's use of an email address associated with the disputed domain name to impersonate representatives of the Complainant, and for phishing, constitutes bad faith use.

The Respondent has not come forward with any evidence to dispute any of the foregoing.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's 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 <csl-behring.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gregory N. Albright/
Gregory N. Albright
Sole Panelist
Date: November 10, 2026