

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

PUMA SE v. EMRE AYDIN

Case No. DCO2025-0091

1. The Parties

Complainant is PUMA SE, Germany, represented by Göhmman Rechtsanwälte Abogados Advokat Steuerberater Partnerschaft mbB, Germany.

Respondent is EMRE AYDIN, Germany.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <puma-colombia.co> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 26, 2025. On October 27, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 28, 2025, 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 (Namecheap, Inc.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on October 28, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on October 30, 2025.

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 5, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 25, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on December 1, 2025.

The Center appointed Stephanie G. Hartung as the sole panelist in this matter on December 9, 2025. 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

Complainant is a company organized under the laws of Germany that is active in the sports products industry.

Complainant has demonstrated to be since many decades the registered owner of numerous trademarks worldwide relating to its company name and brand PUMA, including, but not limited to, the following:

- word trademark PUMA, German Patent and Trademark Office, registration number: 1039451, registration date: October 11, 1982, status: active;
- word trademark PUMA, German Patent and Trademark Office, registration number: 1028880, registration date: February 4, 1982, status: active.

Respondent, according to the Registrar Verification, is located in Germany, too. The disputed domain name was registered on January 22, 2025. By the time of the rendering of this decision, the website to which the disputed domain name resolves is technically blocked. According to Complainant's undisputed contentions, however, at some point before the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website at "www.puma-colombia.co" offering counterfeit versions of Complainant's sports products to e.g., Colombian consumers.

Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to Complainant

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

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

Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's PUMA trademark, as the first part thereof is identical to Complainant's trademark and is added by the descriptive country term "colombia". Moreover, Complainant asserts that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since (1) before the website to which the disputed domain name resolved was taken down, the disputed domain name had been used to offer fake goods of Complainant for sale thereunder, and (2) such use of the disputed domain name demonstrates that Respondent has not been commonly known by the latter and is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use thereof. Finally, Complainant argues that Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith since it intentionally attempted to attract for commercial gain Internet users to its own website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's PUMA trademark.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, Complainant carries the burden of proving:

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

Respondent's default in the case at hand does not automatically result in a decision in favor of Complainant, however, paragraph 5(f) of the Rules provides that if Respondent does not submit a response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute solely based upon the Complaint. Further, according to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences from Respondent's failure to submit a Response as it considers appropriate.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

First, 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 Complainant's PUMA trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of its PUMA trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. Also, the entirety of such trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, simply added by the geographical term "colombia". Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's PUMA trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. Although the addition of other terms (here, the geographical term "Colombia") 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 Complainant's PUMA trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel, therefore, holds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Second, paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which 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 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 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

In particular, Respondent apparently has not been authorized to use Complainant's PUMA trademark, either as a domain name or in any other way. Also, there is no reason to believe that Respondent's name somehow corresponds with the disputed domain name and Respondent does not appear to have any trademark rights associated with the term "puma" on its own. Quite to the contrary, according to the Complaint and at some point before the filing of it, the disputed domain name resolved to a website at "www.puma-colombia.co" offering counterfeit versions of Complainant's sports products to e.g., Colombian consumers. Such use of the disputed domain name, therefore, qualifies neither as bona fide nor as legitimate noncommercial or fair use within the meaning of the Policy. In this context, UDRP panels have long held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, the claimed sale of counterfeit products) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel, therefore, finds the second element of the Policy has been established, too.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Third, 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.

The circumstances to this case lead to the conclusion that Respondent was likely aware of Complainant's rights in its PUMA trademark when registering the disputed domain name and that the latter is clearly directed thereto. Moreover, the fact that, according to the Complaint and at some point before the filing of it, the disputed domain name resolved to a website at "www.puma-colombia.co" offering counterfeit versions of Complainant's sports products to Colombian consumers, is a clear indication that Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its own website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's PUMA trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of Respondent's website. Such circumstances are evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. In this context, UDRP panels have also long held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, the claimed sale of counterfeit products) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

In connection with this finding, it also carries weight in the eyes of the Panel that Respondent obviously provided false or incomplete contact information in the WhoIs register for the disputed domain name since the Written Notice on the Notification of Complaint dated November 5, 2025 could not be delivered due to a wrong address. This fact at least throws a light on Respondent's behavior which supports the Panel's bad faith finding.

The Panel, therefore, holds that Complainant has established the third element of the Policy, too.

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, <puma-colombia.co>, be transferred to Complainant.

/Stephanie G. Hartung/

Stephanie G. Hartung

Sole Panelist

Date: December 18, 2025