Panel Decision for dispute CAC-ADREU-008877

Case number	CAC-ADREU-008877
Time of filing	2026-01-26 02:33:55
Domain names	qopa.eu

Case administrator

	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	GOPA - Gesellschaft für Organisation, Planung und Ausbildung mbH

Complainant representative

Organization	lexTM GmbH Rechtsanwaltsgesellschaft

Respondent

Name	Brian Chase

INSERT INFORMATION ABOUT OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS THE PANEL IS AWARE OF WHICH ARE PENDING OR DECIDED AND WHICH RELATE TO THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings which are pending or decided and which relate to the disputed domain name.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a multi-disciplinary Group of Consulting and Engineering companies dedicated to implementing sustainable projects for a better world, founded in Germany in 1965. More than 900 staff members, along with 5000 international and local experts in seven independent consulting companies, are currently working on approximately 1000 projects worldwide.

The Complainant is the owner of several registered Trademarks, including:

- EU Trademark No. 007444541 for “GOPA” (word mark), registered since July 28, 2009, in respect of goods and services in classes 35, 42, 45;
- German Trademark No. 3020252117969 for “GOPA Tech” (figurative mark), registered since July 1, 2025, in respect of goods and services in classes 35, 42 (hereinafter cumulatively "the Trademark")

The Complainants holds, through its subsidiary GOPA Group Service GmbH several domain names with the Trademark including the .eu-domain name <gopa.eu>, registered since April 7, 2006.

The disputed domain name <qopa.eu> was registered on September 4, 2025. On October 14, 2025 the Complainant became aware of an e-mail account operating under the disputed domain name, impersonating an actual employee of the Complainant.

The Respondent is Brian Chase, a resident of Germany (according to the WHOIS) and has not responded to the Complaint.

A. COMPLAINANT

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name infringes its rights on the Trademark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name is in bad faith. The Complainant, therefore, requests the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

B. RESPONDENT

B. RESPONDENT

No administratively compliant response has been filed.

DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

In order for the Complaint to succeed, the Complainant must show that:

(a) the disputed domain name is identical with or confusingly similar to a name in respect of which a right is established by Union or national law; and either
(b) the disputed domain name has been registered by its holder without rights or legitimate interest in the name; or
(c) the disputed domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

If the Complainants succeed in this respect, in order to obtain a transfer of the disputed domain name, the Complainant must further satisfy the general eligibility criteria for registration set out in Article 3 of the Regulation.

1. Identity or Confusing Similarity of the Disputed Domain Name

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name <qopa.eu> is confusingly similar to the Trademark, in respect of which Complainant has established prior rights recognised by national and Community law.

As regards the question of identity or confusing similarity, it is a consensus view "among the panels (..) that for assessing identity or confusing similarity the .eu suffix has to be disregarded. Concerning confusing similarity, the panel´s review consists of a comparison between the disputed domain name and the name for which a right is recognized or established by national and/or Community law" ("CAC .EU Overview 2.0", Section III. 1).

The disputed domain name consists of a misspelled version of the Trademark, where instead of the letter "g", the letter "q" is used. Due to the writing form of the letters, it is very hard to distinguish the difference, if one does not pay enough attention. This is a very typical case of typosquatting.

2. Legitimate Interest in the Disputed Domain Name

There is no evidence before the Panel to suggest that the Respondent has at any time used the disputed domain name, or a name corresponding to the disputed domain name, in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or that the Respondent has made any demonstrable preparations to do so. Neither is there any indication that the Respondent is making legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name has been used in order to impersonate an actual employee of the Complainant and the Respondent tried to obtain financial gain out of this use, by attempting to deceive the Complainant’s business partner and requesting payments from fabricated invoices.

The Panel further accepts the Complainant's submission that the Respondent is not affiliated with or related to the Complainant in any way, and is neither licensed nor otherwise authorised to make any use of the Complainant’s trade mark, or to apply for or use the disputed domain name. In addition, the Whois information does not suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. Against this background, and absent any response from the Respondent, or any other information indicating the contrary, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

3. Bad Faith Registration and Use

Given the alternative character of Paragraphs B11(d)(1)(ii) and (iii) of the ADR Rules, the Panel does not need to assess further whether the disputed domain name has also been registered or is being used by the Respondent in bad faith.

4. The Complainant's Eligibility

The Complainant is a company based in Germany and having its domicile/place of business within the European Union. The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant satisfies the general eligibility criteria for registration set out in Article 3 of the Regulation.

DECISION

For all the foregoing reasons, in accordance with Paragraphs B12 (b) and (c) of the Rules, the Panel orders that the Complaint is accepted and the disputed domain name <qopa.eu> be transferred to the Complainant.

PANELISTS

Name	**Stefanie Efstathiou LL.M. mult.**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-01-26

Summary

ENGLISH SUMMARY OF THIS DECISION IS HEREBY ATTACHED AS ANNEX 1

I. Disputed domain name: <qopa.eu>

II. Country of the Complainant: Germany, country of the Respondent: Germany

III. Date of registration of the domain name: 4 September 2025

IV. Rights relied on by the Complainant (B(11)(f) ADR Rules) on which the Panel based its decision:

- EU Trademark No. 007444541 for “GOPA” (word mark), registered since July 28, 2009, in respect of goods and services in classes 35, 42, 45;
- German Trademark No. 3020252117969 for “GOPA Tech” (figurative mark), registered since July 1, 2025, in respect of goods and services in classes 35, 42.

V. Response submitted: No

VI. Domain name is confusingly similar to the protected right/s of the Complainant.

VII. Rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent (B(11)(f) ADR Rules):
1. No
2. Why: No authorisation from Complainant, disputed domain name used for fraudulent activity

VIII. Bad faith of the Respondent (B(11)(e) ADR Rules):

1. No
2. Why: alternative character of Paragraphs B11(d)(1)(ii) and (iii) of the ADR Rules

IX. Other substantial facts the Panel considers relevant: not applicable

X. Dispute Result: Transfer of the disputed domain name

XI. Procedural factors the Panel considers relevant: not applicable

XII. Is Complainant eligible? Yes