

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Boehringer Ingelheim Pharma GMBH & CO. KG v. gorg gro, Holoho
Case No. DIO2026-0020

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Boehringer Ingelheim Pharma GMBH & CO. KG, Germany, represented by Nameshield, France.

The Respondent is gorg gro, Holoho, Cyprus.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <boehringer-ingelheim.io> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 4, 2026. On May 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On May 5, 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 ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 5, 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 May 7, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy”), the Rules for .IO Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .IO 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 May 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 28, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Nicholas Weston as the sole panelist in this matter on June 10, 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 German multinational pharmaceutical company with consolidated net sales in 2025 of more than EUR 27.8 billion. The Complainant holds numerous registrations in numerous jurisdictions for the trademark BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM including International Trademark Registration No. 221544 for the word mark BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM., registered on July 2, 1959, in classes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 16, 17, 19, 29, 30, and 32; and International Trademark Registration No. 568844 for the word mark BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM, registered on March 22, 1991, in classes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 16, 30, and 31.

The Complainant is also the owner of, inter alia, the domain name <boehringer-ingelheim.com>, registered since September 1, 1995, which resolves to the company's main website.

The Disputed Domain Name <boehringer-ingelheim.io> was registered on April 27, 2026, and resolves to an inactive webpage.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant cites its trademark registrations for BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM in numerous jurisdictions as prima facie evidence of ownership.

The Complainant submits that the trademark BOEHRINGER INGELHEIM is "well-known". It submits that the Disputed Domain Name is identical to its trademark, because the Disputed Domain Name incorporates in its entirety the BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM. trademark and "that the addition of the [Top-Level Domain] ['.io'] does not change the overall impression of the designation as being connected to the Complainant's trademark".

The Complainant contends that "the Respondent is not affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant in any way. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent." and that "[n]either license nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Complainant's trademark BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM or apply for registration of the disputed domain name by the Complainant". It also contends that as "the disputed domain name points to an inactive page [...]. [I]t proves a lack of legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name [...]". As such, it contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name.

Finally, the Complainant alleges that the registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name was, and currently is, in bad faith, contrary to the Policy and the Rules. It submits that the "the Respondent has registered and used the domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark" and that "the Respondent has not demonstrated any activity in respect of the disputed domain name, and it is not possible to conceive of any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the domain name by the Respondent that would not be illegitimate". It also submits that "the disputed domain name has been set up with [active] MX records which suggests that it may be actively used for email purposes" and this is also indicative of bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

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

- (i) that the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the 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 or is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has produced sufficient evidence to demonstrate that it has registered trademark rights in the mark BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM. The propriety of a domain name registration may be questioned by comparing it to a trademark registered in any country (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)), section 1.2.1).¹

Turning to whether the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM. trademark, the Panel observes that the Disputed Domain Name comprises: (a) an exact reproduction of the Complainant’s BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM. trademark; (b) followed by the generic country-code Top-Level Domain (“ccTLD”) “.io”.

It is well established that the TLD used as technical part of a domain name may be disregarded. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1. The relevant comparison to be made is with the second-level portion of the Disputed Domain Name, specifically: “boehringer-ingelheim”.

It is also well-established that in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark the domain name will normally be considered identical or confusingly similar to that mark for purposes of UDRP standing. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy lists the ways that the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Policy also places the burden of proof on the Complainant to establish the absence of the Respondent’s rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. Because of the inherent difficulties in proving a negative, the consensus view is that the Complainant need only put forward a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. The burden of production then shifts to the Respondent to rebut that prima facie case. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name because it has not licensed, permitted or authorized the Respondent to use the Complainant’s trademark and for those reasons, the Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Complainant also submits that “[t]he Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent”.

This Panel accepts that the Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. Nor, alternatively, is the Respondent making 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.

¹ Noting the similarities between the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (“UDRP”) and the Policy, it is appropriate to have regard to [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) except to the extent that the Policy diverges from the UDRP.

The composition of the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the Complainant's trademark. In this Panel's view, the Complainant has made out an initial prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests because the evidence demonstrates, on balance, that it has an awareness of the Complainant and its mark and intent to take unfair advantage of such, which does not support a finding of any rights or legitimate interests (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1).

In the absence of countervailing evidence, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name.

The Panel finds for the Complainant on the second element of the Policy.

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

The third element of the Policy that a complainant must also demonstrate is that the disputed domain name in question has been registered or used in bad faith. Unlike the position under the UDRP, this is not a conjunctive requirement. It is sufficient to establish only one or the other.

On the issue of registration, given the composition of the Disputed Domain Name, the Panel is satisfied that the Respondent targeted the Complainant's trademark BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM. when it registered the Disputed Domain Name and the Panel is prepared to infer that the Respondent knew, or should have known, that its registration would be identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

In addition, a gap of several years between registration of the Complainant's trademarks and the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name (containing a registered trademark owned by the Complainant) can in certain circumstances be an indicator of bad faith. In this case, the Complainant's rights in the trademark BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM. predate any rights that could possibly flow from the Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name by some 67 years.

On the issue of use, the uncontradicted evidence on record is that the Disputed Domain Name did not and does not currently resolve to an active website. 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. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panelists have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. Factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, (iii) the respondent's taking active steps to conceal its identity or (iv) the use of false or inaccurate contact details (noted to be in breach of its registration agreement). [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the Complainant's widely-known BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM. trademark, the composition of the Disputed Domain Name, absence of a response and the Respondent's use of a privacy service, 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.

This Panel accepts the Complainant's uncontested evidence and finds that the Respondent has registered and used the Complainant's trademark BOEHRINGER-INGELHEIM. in the Disputed Domain Name, without the Complainant's consent or authorization, for the likely purpose of capitalizing on the reputation of the trademark to infringe upon the Complainant's rights.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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, <boehringer-ingelheim.io> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nicholas Weston/

Nicholas Weston

Sole Panelist

Date: June 11, 2026