Panel Decision for dispute CAC-ADREU-008975

Case number	CAC-ADREU-008975
Time of filing	2026-10-26 09:47:15
Domain names	alglovesystems.eu

Case administrator

Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	AL Glove Systems GmbH

Complainant representative

Organization	Kanzlei Schanz Russell

Respondent

Name	Martin van Pelt

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 Complainant reports that it filed a criminal complaint with the police in Hessen, Germany, on July 30, 2026.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, AL Glove Systems GmbH, is a German company which appears to sell protective and safety equipment. The Complainant operates a website at <alglovesystems.de>.

The Complainant relies on its trade name and company name, as well as on several trademark registrations including the following:

– German figurative trademark No. 302025220980, registered on August 25, 2025 in class 9;

– International figurative trademark No. 1910323, registered on February 5, 2026 in class 9, designating, among others, the European Union.

The disputed domain name <alglovesystems.eu> was registered on March 5, 2026. The Complainant submits that it resolved to a website under construction. The Panel observes that the disputed domain name currently does not resolve to an active web page.

The Complainant has submitted copies of electronic messages allegedly sent to third parties since July 22, 2026, from an address linked to the disputed domain name. The messages purported to originate from an employee of the Complainant, reproduced its figurative logo in their signature block, and included a PDF attachment.

A. COMPLAINANT

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical to names in which it holds rights under German and European Union law, including its company and trade names and registered trademarks. It argues that the disputed domain name reproduces its company designation in full and that the difference between the disputed domain name and its own <alglovesystems.de> domain name lies only in the top-level domain.

The Complainant further argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the Respondent is not commonly known by that name and has neither made a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name has instead been used to send deceptive

messages to third parties.

The Complainant primarily submits that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith, and additionally that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith. It relies on the alleged impersonation through emails containing its logo and the name of one of the Complainant's employees, the configuration of MX records, the timing of registration, the correspondence with its company name and with the domain name resolving to its official website, and allegedly inaccurate or irregular registration data. The Complainant contends that the emails linked to the disputed domain name were intended to induce recipients to open attachments or make payments.

B. RESPONDENT

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

DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

Under paragraph B(11)(d)(1) of the ADR Rules, the Complainant must establish that (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a name in respect of which a right is recognised or established by the national law of a Member State and/or European Union law and either (ii) the disputed domain name has been registered by the Respondent without rights or legitimate interests in the name or (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith. The second and third requirements are alternative, not cumulative.

The Panel will deal with each of these requirements in turn.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Article 9(2) of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2020/857 of 17 June 2020, laying down the principles to be included in the contract between the European Commission and the .eu top-level domain Registry in accordance with Regulation (EU) 2019/517 of the European Parliament and of the Council, recognises, among other protected names, registered trademarks and, insofar as protected under the relevant national law, trade names, business identifiers and company names.

The Complainant has shown that it is registered under the company name AL Glove Systems GmbH in Germany and, in the Panel's view, has also sufficiently shown that it enjoys protection of its company and trade name under German law in the framework of the present proceedings.

The Complainant has also established that there are German and international trademarks in which the Complainant has rights. The textual components of the Complainant’s marks are AL GLOVE SYSTEMS and these marks cover protective and safety equipment products.

The disputed domain name corresponds to the Complainant’s company designation. The absence of spaces and of the legal-form abbreviation “GmbH” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The disputed domain name also corresponds to the textual components in the Complainant’s trademarks.

The country-code Top-Level Domain “.eu” is a standard registration requirement and is disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity under the first element.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name is identical or at least confusingly similar to a name in respect of which the Complainant has rights recognised or established by the national law of a Member State and/or European Union law. The first requirement of paragraph B(11)(d)(1) of the ADR Rules is satisfied.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under paragraph B(11)(d)(1)(ii) of the ADR Rules, the Complainant bears the burden of establishing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. Once the Complainant has made a prima facie showing, the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating the contrary. See also WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“WIPO Overview 3.1”), section 2.1, by analogy.

The Panel notes that the Respondent is identified as Martijn Van Pelt and there is no evidence that he is commonly known by the disputed domain name or has acquired corresponding rights. There are no indications that a connection between the Complainant and the Respondent existed.

In addition to being nearly identical to the Complainant's company name, trade name and textual components of its trademarks, the disputed domain name is also nearly identical to the Complainant’s <alglovesystems.de> domain name, differing only in the top-level domain. In the Panel's view, this circumstance is relevant to the likelihood that users or recipients of email communications would assume an affiliation with the Complainant.

More importantly, the evidence submitted by the Complainant indicates that an email address linked to the disputed domain name was used in communications purporting to originate from an employee of the Complainant and reproducing its figurative trademarks. Such impersonation cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Panels have similarly held that use of a domain name for impersonation or fraudulent email activity such as phishing cannot confer rights or legitimate interests. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1, by analogy. The Panel need not determine the precise content or purpose of the attachments to reach this conclusion.

The Respondent has been given the opportunity to demonstrate its rights or legitimate interests but did not do so. In the absence of a Response from the Respondent, the prima facie case established by the Complainant has not been rebutted.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The second requirement is satisfied.

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

Under paragraph B(11)(d)(1) of the ADR Rules, the absence of rights or legitimate interests and registration or use in bad faith are alternative requirements. Having found that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the Panel is not required to decide whether the disputed domain name was registered or used in bad faith. Nevertheless, the Panel briefly addresses this element.

Paragraph B(11)(f) of the ADR Rules sets out a non-exhaustive list of circumstances indicative of bad faith. These include a domain name being intentionally used to attract Internet users, for commercial gain to the Respondent's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with a name in respect of which a right is recognised or established by national and/or European Union law, with such likelihood arising as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website or location of the Respondent.

In the Panel's view, the evidence of emails sent from an address linked to the disputed domain name in the name of an employee of the Complainant, including the reproduction of the Complainant's logo (protected by its figurative trademarks), strongly indicates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and deliberately targeted it, which points to bad faith. This is further strengthened by the disputed domain name reproducing the Complainant's company name, the textual elements of its marks and closely resembling its official domain name.

In the absence of a Response by the Respondent, the above indications of bad faith have not been challenged.

Therefore, the Panel finds that, on the balance of probabilities, it is sufficiently shown that the disputed domain name was registered or is being used in bad faith.

Eligibility for Transfer

Under paragraph B(11)(b) of the ADR Rules, transfer may be ordered where the Complainant satisfies the eligibility criteria of Article 3 of Regulation (EU) 2019/517. The Complainant is a company established in Germany and therefore meets those criteria.

DECISION

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

PANELISTS

Name	**Flip Petillion**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-10-26

Summary

ENGLISH SUMMARY OF THIS DECISION IS HEREBY ATTACHED AS ANNEX 1

I. Disputed domain name: alglovesystems.eu

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

III. Date of registration of the domain name: 5 March 2026

IV. Rights relied on by the Complainant (B(11)(f) ADR Rules) on which the Panel based its decision:
1. Combined trademark registered in Germany, reg. No. 302025220980, for the term AL GLOVE SYSTEMS, registered on 25 August 2025 in respect of goods and services in class 9
2. Combined international trademark registered with WIPO, reg. No. 1910323, for the term AL GLOVE SYSTEMS, registered on 5 February 2025 in respect of goods and services in class 9
3. Business identifier: AL Glove Systems GmbH
4. Company name: AL Glove Systems GmbH

V. Response submitted: No

VI. Domain name is identical to the protected rights of the Complainant

VII. Rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent (B(11)(f) ADR Rules):
1. No
2. Why: evidence of impersonating email communications and no rebuttal.

VIII. Bad faith of the Respondent (B(11)(e) ADR Rules):
1. Yes
2. Why: use of the disputed domain name for communications impersonating the Complainant.

IX. Other substantial facts the Panel considers relevant: N/A

X. Dispute Result: Transfer of the disputed domain name

XI. Procedural factors the Panel considers relevant: N/A

XII. Is Complainant eligible? Yes