

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

A. Nattermann & Cie. GmbH v. Gina Yu
Case No. DCO2026-0067

1. The Parties

The Complainant is A. Nattermann & Cie. GmbH, Germany, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Gina Yu, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bisolvon.co> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 27, 2026. On August 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 28, 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, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 31, 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 2, 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 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 23, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Angelica Lodigiani as the sole panelist in this matter on September 30, 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 the German operating company of the Opella Healthcare Group, a global consumer healthcare business operating in approximately 100 countries through a network of manufacturing sites and research and development centers. Since April 2025, Opella has operated as an independent consumer healthcare company and is among the leading players worldwide in the over-the-counter medicines and vitamins, minerals and supplements sectors, serving more than half a billion consumers worldwide.

The Complainant's product portfolio includes BISOLVON, one of the group's longstanding and well-established brands. Originally launched in 1953, BISOLVON has been marketed for over seventy years as a treatment for cough-related symptoms. Today, BISOLVON products are sold over the counter in numerous countries across Europe, the Asia-Pacific region and Latin America.

The Complainant is the owner of a large portfolio of various BISOLVON trademarks, registered in numerous jurisdictions worldwide, including the following:

- BISOLVON, German registration No. 685527, registered on December 14, 1955, covering goods in class 5;
- BISOLVON, International registration No. 191694, registered on March 26, 1956, covering goods in classes 1 and 5 and designating various jurisdictions;
- BISOLVON, European Union registration No. 002382091, registered on November 29, 2002, covering goods in class 5.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <bisolvon.com>, registered on February 22, 2000, and used to promote its BISOLVON products, and of various other domain names, registered under different country code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") from 2000 to 2024.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 19, 2026 and resolves to an online aftermarket domain name platform where the disputed domain name is offered for sale.

On July 22, 2026, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Registrar's abuse email address, asserting that the disputed domain name had been registered in violation of the Complainant's prior trademark rights and requesting the immediate deletion of the disputed domain name, as well as an undertaking to refrain from any future unauthorized use of the Complainant's trademarks. No response was received to the cease-and-desist letter, nor to the subsequent reminder sent to the Registrar's webform on August 11, 2026.

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 identical to its BISOLVON trademark.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not authorized, licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the BISOLVON trademark or to register domain names incorporating that mark. In addition, the available Whois information identifies the registrant by a name that does not correspond to the disputed domain name, and there is no evidence in the record indicating that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Complainant notes that the disputed domain name resolves to a domain name marketplace website where the disputed domain name is offered for sale. The Complainant further submits that the disputed domain name is listed for sale at a price of USD 1,450, which exceeds the ordinary out-of-pocket costs directly related to the registration of the disputed domain name, and that such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

The Complainant also points out that the disputed domain name was registered long after the Complainant established rights in the BISOLVON mark and long after the registration of the domain name <bisolvon.com>.

Lastly, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith.

The Complainant submits that its BISOLVON trademark is distinctive, has been used for decades and has acquired substantial recognition internationally. The Complainant further notes that it has made significant investments over the years to advertise and promote the BISOLVON trademark worldwide through various media channels and on the Internet. In 2025, Opella's campaigns reached approximately 238 million individuals. In addition, according to Similarweb, the Complainant's website at "www.bisolvon.com" received approximately 31,900 visits in July 2026.

With regard to registration in bad faith, the Complainant contends that the Respondent was aware, or should have been aware, of the Complainant and its BISOLVON trademark when registering the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark and was registered many years after the Complainant acquired rights in the BISOLVON mark. The Complainant further notes that Internet searches for the term "bisolvon" return multiple results relating to the Complainant and its products. In these circumstances, the Complainant submits that it is implausible that the disputed domain name was selected independently of the Complainant or without knowledge of its trademark rights.

The Complainant further argues that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of conduct targeting third-party trademark rights. In this regard, the Complainant notes that the Respondent has previously been the respondent in other UDRP proceedings involving domain names identical or confusingly similar to well-known trademarks, which resulted in the transfer of the disputed domain names to the respective complainants. The Complainant also states that the Respondent has held registrations for additional domain names incorporating well-known third-party trademarks.

In respect of use in bad faith, the Complainant notes that the disputed domain name resolves to a third party's online aftermarket domain name platform where the disputed domain name is offered for sale. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is listed for sale for USD 1,450, an amount exceeding the ordinary out-of-pocket costs directly related to the registration of the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, such conduct demonstrates an intention to profit from the disputed domain name, by attempting to sell or otherwise transfer the disputed domain name for valuable consideration in excess of documented out-of-pocket costs.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has made no bona fide use of the disputed domain name. In the present case, the Complainant contends that, given the identity between the disputed domain name and its BISOLVON trademark, no plausible good-faith use of the disputed domain name can reasonably be envisaged.

Lastly, the Complainant points out that the Respondent's use of a privacy service to hide its identity and the lack of response to its cease-and-desist letter are further evidence of bad faith.

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 identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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 notes that the Complainant did not authorize the Respondent to reflect its BISOLVON trademark in the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent is not connected with the Complainant in any manner whatsoever. Moreover, there is no evidence in the record that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's BISOLVON mark. It is a well-known established principle that domain names identical to a complainant's trademark carry a high risk of affiliation, and that a respondent's use of a domain name will not be considered "fair" if it falsely suggests affiliation with the trademark owner.

Moreover, the disputed domain name is offered for sale on a third party's online aftermarket domain name platform for USD 1,450, an amount likely exceeding the out-of-pocket costs associated with the registration of the disputed domain name. In these circumstances, the Panel finds that such use does not give rise to rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and cannot constitute a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Accordingly, 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has registered a disputed domain name identical to the Complainant's distinctive and well-known BISOLVON mark. In these circumstances, the Panel considers it implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its trademark when registering the disputed domain name. The registration of a domain name, identical to a third party's well-known trademark without rights or legitimate interests, supports a finding of bad faith registration.

As far as use in bad faith is concerned, as mentioned above, the disputed domain name is offered for sale on a third-party online domain name aftermarket platform for an amount which likely exceeds the Respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that the Respondent is seeking to take unfair advantage of the Complainant's trademark rights by profiting from a domain name identical to the Complainant's mark. Such conduct constitutes bad faith use under the Policy. Moreover, by registering a domain name identical to the Complainant's BISOLVON trademark in the ".co" ccTLD, the Respondent has prevented the Complainant from reflecting its trademark in a corresponding domain name under that ccTLD. Furthermore, the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct, as evidenced by the registration of other domain names incorporating well-known third-party trademarks, according to the evidence submitted in support of the Complaint.

Furthermore, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name through a privacy service. While the use of a privacy service is not, in itself, indicative of bad faith, it may support such a finding when considered in light of the surrounding circumstances. In the present case, the Complainant has shown that the Respondent has previously been the respondent in other UDRP proceedings resulting in the transfer of domain names incorporating third-party trademarks. The record also indicates that the Respondent has held other domain names corresponding to well-known third-party marks. In addition, the Respondent failed to reply to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter despite being put on notice of the Complainant's trademark rights.

Taken together, these circumstances reinforce the Panel's view that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Accordingly, 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 <bisolvon.co> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Angelica Lodigiani/

Angelica Lodigiani

Sole Panelist

Date: October 14, 2026