



CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL INTERNET DISPUTE RESOLUTION CENTRE

DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL

DECISION

CIIDRC case number:	26853-UDRP	May 4, 2026
Domain Name:	rhenusnetwork.com	
Registrar:	Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu	
Panel:	Richard C. Levin	
Complainant:	Rhenus SE & Co. KG.	
Respondent:	Matthis Koenig	

1. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The procedural history of this case was set out in a letter/email from the Canadian International Internet Dispute Centre (CIIDRC) to the Panel on April 27, 2026.

- a. On March 12, 2026, counsel for the Complainant filed a Complaint pursuant to the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (Policy) and the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (Rules) via the online platform.
- b. On March 13, 2026, CIIDRC transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name, and on March 17, 2026, the Registrar responded advising of the identity of the Respondent and providing the contact details. In addition, the Registrar confirmed that the Disputed Domain Name was placed in a Registrar LOCK.
- c. The Complainant was informed of the Respondent's information as provided by the Registrar and subsequently amended the Complaint on March 24, 2026, to provide certain specific details regarding Respondent. That amended Complaint is hereinafter referred to as the Complaint.
- d. On March 27, 2026, CIIDRC confirmed compliance of the Complaint and commencement of the dispute resolution process.

- e. On March 27, 2026, pursuant to UDRP Rule 4 and CIIDRC Supplemental Rule 5, CIIDRC notified the Respondent of this administrative proceeding and forwarded a Notice of Complaint to the Respondent.
- f. The deadline for submitting a Response was set for April 16, 2026. No Response was received by the deadline, nor has any been submitted thereafter.
- g. The Complainant in this administrative proceeding has elected for a Panel consisting of a single member. The required Panel fee deposit was received on April 20, 2026.
- h. CIIDRC appointed the undersigned Richard C. Levin as a single-member Panel in the above-referenced matter by email on April 27, 2026.
- i. The Panel finds that it is properly constituted and has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by CIIDRC to ensure compliance with the UDRP Rule 7.

The Domain Name (referred to above in the title box and referred to before and hereinafter as Disputed Domain Name) was registered December 24, 2025, according to information provided by the Registrar.

This matter is conducted pursuant to the Policy and the Rules of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN).

2. FACTS ALLEGED BY THE PARTIES

As Respondent has not appeared in this matter, the Panel will decide the dispute based on the Complaint per the specific Rules as stated below. Thus, the facts recited herein come from the Complaint and its Annexes and Schedules.

Complainant is a large world-wide logistics company with its headquarters in Germany and offices in many countries, including a large Canadian subsidiary and offices throughout Canada including Ontario (Schedule C to the Complaint). According to the Complaint (page 5) and corroborated by internet research “Complainant employs more than 39,000 individuals internationally across 1,120 sites. As a result of its far reach and enormous capabilities, the Complainant has become one of the most well-known logistics services providers in the world.” Complainant states that it has world-wide recognition and good will through its business and its trademarks both in Canada (since at least as early as 2000 per Schedule A) and many other foreign countries (Complaint and Schedule A, trademarks, Schedule B, which is its Canadian website and showing the world-wide scope of the business and services Complainant provides).

Regarding Respondent, Complainant alleges as follows (starting on Page 5): recently, someone (one Thomas Felber) registered a corporation named Rhenus Worldwide Logistics Inc. with the Ontario Ministry of Public and

Business Service Delivery. The corporation lists its registered office address in Ontario, which happens to be a UPS Store according to the Complaint. The use of Complainant's name was done without its consent. The registration of this company was accomplished on December 23, 2025. Schedule D.

Around the same time, Complainant learned that someone had begun operating a website with the Disputed Domain Name without Complainant's consent. The Disputed Domain Name was registered one day later than the incorporation above, on December 24, 2025. The website purports to be the website for a "comprehensive logistics, warehousing, and transport solutions" named Rhenus Worldwide Logistics Inc. and lists its address as the very same address as the one in the incorporation papers in Ontario above. Complainant has attached copies of the pages of the website from the Disputed Domain Name as Schedule E. Complainant states there is no question that this website purports to advertise a business which operates in the exact same shipping and logistics lanes as Complainant. (Page 6).

The matter came to a head in early February 2026, when a Canadian export facilitating agency contacted Complainant regarding goods being exported by Rhenus Worldwide Logistics Inc. to Germany. This prompted Complainant's counsel, on March 2, 2026, to send a cease-and-desist letter to the address in the Disputed Domain Name's website and Mr. Felber, Schedule G, and demanding, among other things, the Disputed Domain Name be transferred to Complainant. (Page 6).

Respondent's "Consent": On the same day, Mr. Felber, purporting to speak on behalf of the named Respondent, the Registrant, one M Koenig, agreed via two emails back to Complainant's counsel, but has not answered Complaint's request to confirm the transfer. Schedule H. Evidently the Disputed Domain Name now resolves to a Greenpeace site on Instagram, but Complainant correctly is concerned the removed content could be switched back to the offending website and seeks a UDRP determination of transfer. The Panel agrees it is best to proceed. It is not prudent to put away your umbrella merely because the rain lets up in a rainstorm. WIPO Overview 3.1 at 4.10. Eg, *Patriot Supply Store, Inc., d/b/a My Patriot Supply v. Domain May be for Sale, Check Afternic.Com Domain Admin, Domain Registries Foundation*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1573](#).

3. CONTENTIONS OF THE PARTIES

The Complainant asserts that the Disputed Domain Name satisfies the three touchstones of the Policy. First, Complainant submits that the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the principal word elements of its trademark, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to a mark in which the Complainant had rights prior to registration of the Disputed Domain Name and continues to have rights. Furthermore, Complainant asserts that the circumstances are such the Registrant has no legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name, and, as well, that the Domain Name was registered and used in bad faith per the purpose of the Policy.

The Respondent has not filed a Response.

Remedy Sought:

The Complainant requests the Domain Name be transferred to it.

4. DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

4.1 Requirements

In accordance with Paragraph 4 of the Policy, the burden is on the Complainant to prove:

- a. That the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- b. That the Registrant (Respondent) has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name; and
- c. That the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and being used in bad faith.

The Panel will consider each of these requirements in turn. Importantly, in view of the Respondent's failure to submit a Response, the Panel will decide this administrative proceeding on the basis of the Complainant's undisputed representations pursuant to paragraphs 5(f), 14(a) and 15(a) of the Rules and draw such inferences as it considers appropriate pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules. The Panel is entitled to accept all reasonable allegations set forth in a Complaint. However, the Panel may deny relief where a complaint contains mere conclusory or unsubstantiated arguments. See WIPO Overview 3.1 at 4.3.

4.2 Analysis

4.2.1 The Domain Name is Identical or Confusingly Similar to a Mark in which the Complainant has Rights

The threshold standing issue confronting any panel in a UDRP proceeding is whether a complainant has rights in the trademark or service mark to which that complainant claims a disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar. The Complainant has shown clearly that it has rights to the Rhenus name as it has registered numerous trademarks throughout the world and has domain names incorporating these marks. This evidence is attached to the Complaint as Schedule A.

Furthermore, Complainant also has satisfied its burden of proving that the Disputed Domain Name "rhenusnetwork.com" is identical or confusingly similar to its marks with its corporate name Rhenus. While the

first part of the Disputed Domain Name is the very word “rhenus,” adding the simple descriptive words or phrase “network” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. See WIPO Overview 3.1 at 1.7, 1.8. In this case, this is bolstered by the fact that content of the website associated with the Disputed Domain Name (from Schedule E to the Complaint) itself targets/has targeted Complainant’s marks as Respondent is passing itself off as being sponsored by, endorsed by, or otherwise connected to Complainant. See WIPO Overview 3.1 at 1.15; *Bayerische Motoren Werke AG (“BMW”) v. Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC / Armands Piebalgs*, WIPO Case No. D2017-0156₂, where the panel found Respondent’s use of “BMWdecoder.com” for its non-authorized business to provide repair history on BMW vehicles to be confusingly similar to the BMW mark. Complainant here has shown that Respondent’s website uses Complainant’s mark in such a way as to confuse the consumer that Respondent’s services, such as “Global Logistics Solutions” is in some way sponsored or authorized by Complainant. See Schedule E to the Complaint.

Complainant satisfies the first prong of the Policy with this showing.

4.2.2 Rights or Legitimate Interests in respect of the Domain Name

The Complainant in addition needs to at least make a showing that Respondent lacks rights to or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Panel will reference the three nonexclusive examples listed in the Policy through which Respondent might demonstrate a legitimate interest (see Policy Paragraph 4 (c)). Initially, the Panel makes the obvious inference that Respondent Koenig and Thomas Felber are connected. Koenig registered the Disputed Domain Name for the very same company that was incorporated the day before by Felber, Rhenus Worldwide Logistics Inc. Felber answered the cease-and-desist letter on behalf of that company whose website Respondent Koenig registered. See Rules 14 (b); WIPO Overview 3.1 at 4.3 (noting that “panels have been prepared to draw certain inferences in light of the particular facts and circumstances of the case e.g., where a particular conclusion is prima facie obvious, where an explanation by the respondent is called for but is not forthcoming, or where no other plausible conclusion is apparent.”)

- A. Before notice of this dispute, is there any evidence of the 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? The Panel finds there is not. The Panel finds Respondent’s registered the Disputed Domain Name years after Complainant was up and running as one of the largest well-known logistics companies in the world and Canada. Moreover, the evidence to this Panel is that Respondent has not been using the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a *bona fide* offering of goods or services. The evidence is that Complainant has held its marks long before the establishment of Disputed Domain Name which, as noted above, is confusingly similar, and to the extent Respondent

is/has been offering overlapping, competing services, that offering would not be in good faith. As in *SoftCom Technology Consulting Inc. v. Olariu Romeo/Orv Fin Group S.L.*, WIPO Case No. D2008-0792, the panel noted: “[f]or its offering of goods or services under the ... mark to be *bona fide*, Respondent must have had no knowledge of Complainant’s prior rights to the ... mark and must also have used the mark in good faith.” Here, the evidence is inescapable that Respondent is not connected with the Complainant and has used the Complainant’s trademark on the website with the intention to derive advantage from user confusion, seen recently with the Canadian export facilitating agency incident.

- B.** Has Respondent been commonly known by the domain name? The Panel finds it is not. As noted by Complainant, the use of “Rhenus” in the Disputed Domain Name and on the website is a direct reference to the Complainant and the Respondent has never been associated with Complainant. There is no evidence presented of Respondent owning any Rhenus trademarks and does not have any consent or authorization to use the Rhenus marks or variations. Respondent has not come forward with evidence it is related or connected in any way to the Complainant. On the contrary, the Complainant states “it has not authorized or licensed the Registrant to use the trademark RHENUS and no such agreement is or has ever been in place between the Complainant and the Registrant.” Complaint, page 9. Finally, the UDRP requires that Respondent’s claim of being commonly known be “legitimate.” See WIPO Overview 3.1 at 2.3. Nothing is legitimate about misappropriating Complainant’s mark for use as a domain name.
- C. Is Respondent making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain misleadingly to divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue? The Panel finds it is not doing so. There is no non-commercial use as the website is/has been intended to sell its logistics services and suggesting Complainant’s connection or at least endorsement. And there is no “fair use” of the Disputed Domain Name where Respondent is taking advantage (or at least intends to take advantage) of the Complainant’s name and registered marks creating a likelihood of consumer confusion. See WIPO Overview 3.1 at 2.5.1.

Complainant satisfies the second prong of the Policy.

4.2.3 Registration and Use of the Domain Name in Bad Faith

Finally, the Policy in paragraph 4(b)(iv) states that bad faith under this third prong may be shown in a number of ways, including stating four examples, of which the “disrupting the business of a competitor” and the following are especially apposite in this case:

“By using the domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the respondent’s website....”

There is no question of Respondent’s use of a confusingly similar domain name, as discussed above; and no question that Complainant’s marks preceded in date by many years Respondent’s registration of the Disputed Domain Name; and no question that the Complainant’s Rhenus marks are strong and highly distinctive; and no question, or the inference is inescapable, that Respondent is/has been trying to create the false impression that it is affiliated with, connected to, or endorsed by Complainant. That Respondent has not answered in this case allows the panel to make such inferences as appropriate per Rule 14(b) as noted above.

The above cited BMW case is instructive on this third prong of the UDRP. *Bayerische Motoren Werke AG (“BMW”) v. Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC / Armands Piebalgs*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0156](#).

Recall in that case, respondent used the add on word “decoder” to BMW for its business of giving information about BMW vehicles but was not authorized by BMW itself. The Panel stated as follows relating to the bad faith prong of the UDRP, quoting in full, as the case is on point:

In the present circumstances, the distinctive nature of the BMW trademark, and the evidence as to the extent of the reputation the Complainant enjoys in the BMW trademark, and the confusingly similar nature of the Disputed Domain Names to the BMW trademark, and the lack of any explanation from the Respondents as to why they registered the Disputed Domain Names leads the Panel to conclude the registration and use was in bad faith. In the present case, the Panel concludes that it is inconceivable that the Respondents selected the Disputed Domain Names independently and without knowledge of the Complainant or its products. The websites operated by the Respondents at the Disputed Domain Names are clearly promoting a business which supplies technical information about BMW vehicles and the Panel has no doubt the Respondents were by use of the Disputed Domain Names seeking to suggest they had a connection with the Complainant in the course of trade, by suggesting that they were the Complainant’s business, or were authorised by the Complainant. They are neither. It is quite clear that by use of the Complainant’s BMW trademark or an abbreviation thereof, combined with the word “decoder”, they were seeking to attract customers who were looking for a source of technical information about BMW vehicles. It does not matter whether or not the information then provided was accurate or not, as what the Respondents are doing is using the Complainant’s trademark (or a contraction thereof) as part of the Disputed Domain Names to suggest they are likely to be an authorised source of such information. As such their behaviour clearly amounts to that specified in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy as being evidence of registration and use in bad faith, namely “by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your web site or other on-line

location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your web site or location or of a product or service on your web site or location”.

Accordingly, Complainant has made a sufficient showing to satisfy the third prong of the Policy.

5. DECISION and ORDER

For the above reasons, in accordance with Paragraph 4 of the Policy, Paragraph 15 of the Rules, and Rule 10 of the Supplemental Rules, the Panel orders that: the Disputed Domain Name be transferred to Complainant.

Made as of May 4, 2026



Richard C. Levin

