

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Grohe AG v. Mr. Vahid Enayatkhah Digesarayi  
Case No. DIR2025-0009

### **1. The Parties**

Complainant is Grohe AG, Germany, represented Wolpert Rechtsanwälte, Germany.

Respondent is Mr. Vahid Enayatkhah Digesarayi, Iran (Islamic Republic of).

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <faucetsgrohe.ir> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with IRNIC.

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 29, 2025. On September 30, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to IRNIC a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On October 1, 2025, IRNIC transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name, which differed from the named Respondent (unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on October 3, 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 6, 2025. Hard copies of the Complaint were received by the Center on October 3, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint and the amendment to the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .ir Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “irDRP”), the Rules for .ir Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .ir Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2(a) and 4(a), the Center formally notified Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on October 15, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5(a), the due date for Response was November 4, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on November 1, 2025.

The Center appointed Marina Perraki as the sole panelist in this matter on November 7, 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 active in the field of sanitary products and is the owner of numerous GROHE trademark registrations, including the international trademark registration No. 1384073, GROHE (word), registered on September 5, 2017, for goods in international classes, 9, 11, 20, and 21 and the international trademark registration No. 1156148, GROHE PROFESSIONAL (word), registered on February 18, 2013, for goods in international classes 11, 20, and 21. Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <grohe.com>.

The Domain Name was registered on April 16, 2023, and leads to a website selling sanitary goods, prominently displaying the trademarks of Complainant and including Complainant's company history.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

##### **B. Respondent**

Respondent submitted its response on November 1, 2025, to the Center requesting that the Complaint be dismissed, invoking legitimate interest in using the Grohe name "descriptively to identify the type of products offered (i.e., Grohe faucets)". Respondent also invokes lack of bad faith. Respondent states that the website was created solely for informational and promotional purposes regarding Grohe products to customers in Iran and does not contain any "misleading commercial activity or intent". It is not possible to effect purchases online through the website, sales are effected only through physical stores. Respondent's website presents genuine Grohe faucets available "through authorized or legitimate channels" in the Iranian market. The Domain Name was registered in good faith and is not being used to divert customers or gain unfair commercial advantage. Respondent is not an official distributor of Complainant's products but "acts as a reseller and promoter of authentic Grohe products, which are available in Iran through various importers". The website content makes it clear that it is an independent informational website. The website's goal is "to educate and inform users about these products, not to impersonate or infringe upon Grohe's identity".

#### **6. Discussion and Findings**

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists the three elements which Complainant must satisfy with respect to the Domain Name:

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

## A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Complainant has demonstrated rights through registration in the GROHE mark.

The Panel finds that the Domain Name, which incorporates Complainant's GROHE mark in its entirety plus the descriptive for sanitary goods English word "faucet", is confusingly similar to the GROHE trademark of Complainant. The addition of the term "faucet" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The country code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".ir" is disregarded, as ccTLDs typically do not form part of the comparison on the grounds that they are required for technical reasons only<sup>1</sup>.

Complainant has established Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i).

## B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, Respondent may establish its rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, among other circumstances, by showing any of the following elements:

(i) before any notice to Respondent of the dispute, Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

(ii) Respondent (as an individual, business, or other organization) has been commonly known by the Domain Name, even if it has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The Panel concludes that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name.

Prior to the notice of the dispute, Respondent did not demonstrate any use of the Domain Name or a trademark corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

On the contrary, as Complainant demonstrated, the Domain Name resolves to a website, which suggests falsely that it is a website of Complainant. In the "About Us" section of the website the content refers to Complainant and not to Respondent, presenting Complainant's history and its group.

Per Complainant and as Respondent affirmed, Respondent is not an affiliated entity or an authorised distributor or reseller of Complainant. Furthermore, per Complaint, no agreement, express or otherwise, exists allowing the use of Complainant's trademarks on the website and the use of the Domain Name by Respondent.

A distributor or reseller can be making a bona fide offering of goods and thus have a legitimate interest in a domain name only if the following cumulative requirements are met (*Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#); [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.8.1: (i) respondent must actually be offering the goods at issue; (ii) respondent must use the site to sell only the trademarked goods; (iii) the site must accurately and prominently disclose the registrant's relationship with the trademark holder; and (iv) respondent must not try to "corner the market" in domain names that reflect the trademark.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Panel follows prior decisions under the irDRP and, given the similarities between the irDRP and the Uniform Domain Name Resolution Policy ("UDRP"), finds it appropriate to refer to UDRP jurisprudence, including reference to the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"). See *Inter IKEA Systems BV (IISBV) v. Mohammadreza Mohammadian*, WIPO Case No. [DIR2018-0003](#).

These requirements are not cumulatively fulfilled in the present case. The Domain Name falsely suggests that the website is an official site of Complainant or of an entity affiliated to or endorsed by Complainant. The website extensively reproduces, without authorization by Complainant, Complainant's trademarks, company name and history, without any disclaimer of association (or lack thereof) with Complainant. Furthermore, as the Panel notes, the website also includes third party products.

The Panel finds that these circumstances do not confer upon Respondent any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name.

Complainant has established Policy, paragraph 4(a)(ii).

### **C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith**

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides that the following circumstances, "in particular but without limitation", are evidence of the registration and use of the Domain Name in "bad faith":

(i) circumstances indicating that Respondent has registered or has acquired the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Domain Name registration to Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of its documented out of pocket costs directly related to the Domain Name; or

(ii) Respondent has registered the Domain Name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) Respondent has registered the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the Domain Name, Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent's website or location or of a product or service on Respondent's website or location.

The Panel concludes that Respondent has registered and used the Domain Name in bad faith. Because the GROHE mark had been widely used and registered at the time of the Domain Name registration by Respondent the Panel finds it more likely than not that Respondent had Complainant's mark in mind when registering the Domain Name (*Tudor Games, Inc. v. Domain Hostmaster, Customer ID No. 09382953107339 dba Whois Privacy Services Pty Ltd / Domain Administrator, Vertical Axis Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-1754](#); *Parfums Christian Dior v. Javier Garcia Quintas and Christiandior.net*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0226](#)). This is confirmed by Respondent who stated that the website intends to inform users on Complainant's products, therefore was aware of Complainant's products and brand.

As regards bad faith use of the Domain Name, Complainant has demonstrated that the Domain Name was used to create a website, which prominently displays Complainant's registered trademarks, logos, and company history, thereby giving the false impression that it is operated by Complainant or a company affiliated to Complainant. The Domain Name operates therefore by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's trademark and business as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website it resolves to. This can be used in support of bad faith registration and use (*Booking.com BV v. Chen Guo Long*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0311](#); *Ebel International Limited v. Alan Brashear*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0001](#); *Walgreen Co. v. Muhammad Azeem / Wang Zheng, Nicenic International Group Co., Limited*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1607](#); *Oculus VR, LLC v. Sean Lin*, WIPO Case No. [DCO2016-0034](#); and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4).

The Panel considers the following factors: (i) the reputation of Complainant's mark, (ii) the fact that the website displays not only Complainant's but also other brands and includes Complainant's history in the "About Us" section, and (iii) the Domain Name resolves to a website which gives the false impression that it is operated by Complainant or an official retailer of Complainant, without any disclaimer.

Under these circumstances and on this record, the Panel finds that Respondent has registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

Complainant has established Policy, paragraph 4(a)(iii).

## **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 Domain Name <faucetsgrohe.ir> be transferred to Complainant.

*/Marina Perraki /*

**Marina Perraki**

Sole Panelist

Date: November 17, 2025