

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Rödl Equity Partner Beteiligung GmbH & Co. KG,
Prof. Dr. Christian Rödl, LL.M. (Columbia University, New York) v.
Ireneusz Bachurski Przedsiębiorstwo INFO-BI
Case No. DEU2025-0018

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Rödl Equity Partner Beteiligung GmbH & Co. KG and Prof. Dr. Christian Rödl, LL.M. (Columbia University, New York), Germany, represented by Rödl GmbH Rechtsanwaltsgesellschaft Steuerberatungsgesellschaft, Germany.

The Respondent is Ireneusz Bachurski Przedsiębiorstwo INFO-BI, Poland.

2. The Domain Name, Registry and Registrar

The Registry of the disputed domain name <rodl.eu> is the European Registry for Internet Domains ("EURid" or the "Registry"). The Registrar of the disputed domain name is INFOCAL sp. z o.o..

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 18, 2025. On July 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registry a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 24, 2025, the Registry transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .eu Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules (the "ADR Rules") and the World Intellectual Property Organization Supplemental Rules for .eu Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules (the "Supplemental Rules").

In accordance with the ADR Rules, Paragraph B(2), the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 29, 2025. In accordance with the ADR Rules, Paragraph B(3), the due date for Response was August 18, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 19, 2025.

The Center appointed Luca Barbero as the sole panelist in this matter on August 21, 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 ADR Rules, Paragraph B(5).

4. Factual Background

Rödl Equity Partner Beteiligung GmbH & Co. KG (hereinafter, the “first Complainant”) is a large auditing and consulting firm, specialized in legal, tax, financial and IT consulting since 1977. With headquarters in Nuremberg, Germany, it has more than 110 offices in 50 countries.

Prof. Dr. Christian Rödl, LL.M (hereinafter, the “second Complainant”) is the managing partner, chairman of the management board and major shareholder of the first Complainant.

The first Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations for RÖDL & PARTNER and ROEDL & PARTNER, including the following, as per trademark registration details submitted as annexes 6 to the Complaint:

- International trademark registration No. 801971 for RÖDL & PARTNER (word mark), registered on February 25, 2003, in classes 35, 36 and 42;
- European Union trademark registration No. 003062924 for RÖDL & PARTNER (word mark), filed on February 21, 2003, and registered on January 4, 2005, in classes 35, 36 and 42; and
- German trademark registration No. 302014041342 for ROEDL & PARTNER (word mark), filed on March 18, 2014, and registered on May 16, 2014, in classes 35, 36 and 45.

The second Complainant instead, is the owner of trademark registrations for ROEDL and RÖDL, including:

- International trademark registration No. 940658 for RÖDL (word mark), registered on June 22, 2007, in classes 35, 36 and 45;
- European Union trademark registration No. 006026281 for RÖDL (word mark), filed on June 21, 2007, and registered on April 23, 2008, in classes 35, 36 and 45; and
- German trademark registration No. 302014041341 for ROEDL, filed on March 18, 2014, and registered on May 16, 2014, in classes 35, 36 and 45.

The Complainants also own numerous domain names including <roedl.com>, registered on June 25, 1997, and <roedl.de>, registered on September 17, 2008, which are being used by the Complainants to promote their advisory and legal consultancy services under the trademark RÖDL & PARTNER.

The disputed domain name <rodl.eu> was registered on November 30, 2024, and redirects to an internal page of the website “www.sedo.com” where the disputed domain name is being offered for sale.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants contend that the disputed domain name <rodl.eu> is confusingly similar to the trademarks RÖDL, ROEDL, RÖDL & PARTNER and ROEDL & PARTNER in which the Complainants have rights. The Complainants submit that the disputed domain name reproduces the RÖDL mark in its entirety with the mere exclusion of the umlaut above the letter "o" and the addition of the country code Top Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".eu".

The Complainants highlight that the letters "ö" and "o" are in any case visually almost identical and submit that the average consumer (especially whose language does not contain umlauts) will pronounce the two letters "ö" and "o" and the corresponding signs "Rödl" and "Rodl" in the same way.

Moreover, the Complainants underline that the signs "Rödl" and "Rodl" are also phonetically (almost) identical and that the same applies to the two letter "oe", and goes on to explain that the letter "ö" was not registerable as part of a ".com" domain name until the Internationalized Domain Name (IDN) standard was adopted and that before this, the functional of the letter "ö" was "oe", which to date is still the commonly used functional equivalent both for people using keyboards without the letter "ö" and in certain German dialects, such as Swiss German.

The Complainants also submit that the disputed domain name is "functionally identical" to their registered trademarks RÖDL & PARTNER and ROEDL & PARTNER since ampersands cannot be registered as parts of domain names and the word "partner" is commonly used by law and financial firms and is understood as referring to the nature of the business.

The Complainants state that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, since: i) the Respondent has not been licensed or otherwise authorized to use the Complainants' trademarks and/or to register the disputed domain name; ii) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name; iii) the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name; and iv) the Respondent's offer for sale of the disputed domain name on the website to which the disputed domain name redirects evidences the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests.

With reference to the circumstances evidencing bad faith, the Complainants submit that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting or otherwise transferring it to the Complainants, which are the holders of a name in respect of which a right is recognised or established by national and/or European Union law, according to Section B (11)(f)(1) of the ADR Rules. The Complainants points out that this applies in particular in view of the fact that the disputed domain name only misses one letter of the name 'Roedl', in which the Complainants have rights, and this is therefore a clear case of typosquatting.

The Complainants further state that the Respondent was involved as respondent in numerous other domain name disputes which it has all lost, namely, *Arcelormittal v. Ireneusz Bachurski Przedsiębiorstwo INFO-BI*, ADR Case No. CAC-ADREU-008530 (<mital.eu>), *CEO Dennis Overby Madsen BA (Adone ApS) v. Ireneusz Bachurski Przedsiębiorstwo INFO-BI*, ADR Case No. CAC-ADREU- 008703 (<adone.eu >) and *BAL DU MOULIN ROUGE v. Ireneusz Bachurski Przedsiębiorstwo INFO-BI*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-5077](#) (<moulinrouge.com>) and conclude that the Respondent has repeatedly tried to benefit from the reputation of names or trademarks of others by registering domain names with the same name or only with one letter missing.

The Complainants also assert that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainants' trademark and is using the disputed domain name to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainants' earlier marks and domain names.

The Complainants further submit that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in order to sell it, which would evidence the Respondent's bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainants' contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Issues

Due to the similarities of the ADR Rules and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "UDRP"), the Panel will also take into account the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), and the cases decided under both the UDRP and the ADR Rules.

6.2. Substantive Issues

Pursuant to Paragraph B(11)(d)(1) of the ADR Rules, the Panel shall issue a decision granting the remedies requested by the Complainants in the event that the Complainants prove the following elements:

- (i) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a name in respect of which a right is recognized or established by the national law of a Member State and/or European Union law and; either
- (ii) the domain name has been registered by the Respondent without rights or legitimate interest in the name; or
- (iii) the domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar to a name in respect of which a right or rights are recognized or established by national law of a Member State and/or European Union law

For the purposes of Paragraph B11(d)(1)(i), in an ADR Proceeding where the respondent is the holder of a .eu domain name registration in respect of which the complaint was brought, the complainant must prove that the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a name in respect of which a right is recognized or established by the national law of a Member State and/or European Union law.

In the case at hand, the Complainants have shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the ADR rules, paragraph B11(d)(1)(i). Indeed, the Complainants have provided evidence of ownership of valid trademark registrations for, or incorporating, RÖDL and ROEDL, including the European Union trademark registration No. 006026281 for RÖDL (word mark) and the German trademark registration No. 302014041341 for ROEDL (word mark).

The Panel notes that both trademarks are reproduced in the disputed domain name, with the mere omission of the umlaut above the letter "o" in the first mark and of the letter "e" of the second mark. Therefore, the Complainants' trademarks are recognizable within the disputed domain name. A domain name which contains a common or obvious misspelling of a trademark normally will be found to be confusingly similar to such trademark, where the trademark remains recognizable within the domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

The ".eu" ccTLD can be disregarded for the purposes of assessing confusing similarity with the Complainants' trademarks since it is a standard technical requirement for registration. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainants' marks for the purposes of the ADR Rules, Paragraph B11(d)(1)(i).

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under Paragraph B(11)(e) of the ADR Rules, rights or legitimate interests may be demonstrated where:

(i) prior to any notice of the dispute, the respondent has used the disputed domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with the offering of goods and services or has made demonstrable preparations to do so; (ii) the respondent, being an undertaking, organization or natural person, has been commonly known by the domain name, even in absence of a right recognized or established by national and/or European Union law; (iii) the respondent is making a legitimate and non-commercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent to mislead consumers or harm the reputation of a name in respect of which a right is recognized or established by national and/or European Union law.

While the overall burden of proof in ADR Rules proceedings lies with the complainant, panels have acknowledged that proving a respondent lacks its rights or legitimate interests in a domain name can often result in the challenging task of "proving a negative", which requires information typically within the respondent's knowledge or control. Consequently, when a complainant establishes a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to provide relevant evidence demonstrating their rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the respondent fails to present such 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 the Complainants have established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainants' prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes that there is no relation, disclosed to the Panel or otherwise apparent from the record, between the Respondent and the Complainants. The Respondent is not an affiliate or licensee of the Complainants, nor has the Respondent otherwise obtained authorization to use the Complainants' marks.

Moreover, there is no element from which the Panel could infer the Respondent's rights over the disputed domain names, or that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes the similarity with the Complainant's trademark, corresponding to the surname of the Complainants' managing partner and chairman, the composition of the disputed domain name, which appears to be a misspelling of the Complainants' trademarks RÖDL and ROEDL, and the redirection of the disputed domain name to a web page where it is offered for sale, and finds that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services under Paragraph B(11)(e)(1) of the ADR Rules, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use according to Paragraph B(11)(e)(3) of the ADR Rules.

Therefore, the Panel finds the Complainants have satisfied the condition set out at Paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(ii) of the ADR Rules.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

As the two conditions set forth in Paragraphs B(11)(d)(1)(i) and (ii) of the ADR Rules have already been fulfilled, the Panel does not need to examine whether the Respondent has registered or is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, under Paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(iii) of the ADR Rules.

However, the Panel has done it by its own discretion and finds out that the conditions listed in Paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(iii) of the ADR Rules have also been met.

The Panel finds that, in view of the prior registration of the Complainants' trademarks RÖDL, ROEDL, RÖDL & PARTNER and ROEDL & PARTNER, and the Complainants' promotion of their activities online under such trademarks on the websites at "www.roedl.com" and "www.roedl.de", the Respondent was or should have been aware of the Complainants and their trademark rights at the time of registration. Indeed, a simple online search would have revealed the existence of the Complainants and their trademarks. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2.

The Panel further finds that, considering the redirection of the disputed domain name to a website offering it for sale, the Respondent intentionally used the disputed domain name to attract Internet users, for commercial gain, to such website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainants and their trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website, according to Paragraph B(11)(f)(4) of the ADR Rules.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered likely in order to prevent the Complainants from reflecting their marks in a corresponding domain name, and that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct according to B(11)(f)(2)(i) of the ADR Rules, as it has been involved as respondent in at least three prior domain name disputes which were concluded with the transfer of the domain names to the complainants, i.e. *BAL DU MOULIN ROUGE v. Ireneusz Bachurski Przedsiębiorstwo INFO-BI*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-5077](#) (<moulinrouge.com>), *Arcelormittal v. Ireneusz Bachurski Przedsiębiorstwo INFO-BI*, ADR Case No. CAC-ADREU-008530 (<mital.eu>) and *Adone ApS v. Ireneusz Bachurski Przedsiębiorstwo INFO-BI*, ADR Case No. CAC-ADREU-008703 (<adone.eu>).

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainants have established the third element set out at Paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(iii) of the ADR Rules as well.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with Paragraph B(11) of the ADR Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name, <rod1.eu> be transferred to the first Complainant.¹

/Luca Barbero/

Luca Barbero

Sole Panelist

Date: September 4, 2025

¹ (i) The decision shall be implemented by the Registry within thirty (30) days after the notification of the decision to the Parties, unless the Respondent initiates court proceedings in a Mutual Jurisdiction, as defined in Paragraph A(1) of the ADR Rules.

(ii) As the first Complainant is located in Germany, a Member State of the European Union, it satisfies the general eligibility criteria for registration of the disputed domain name set out in Article 3 of the Regulation (EU) 2019/517. Therefore, the first Complainant is entitled to request the transfer of the disputed domain name.