

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

CoorsTek, Inc. v. Eric Jordan, aarq  
Case No. D2025-1676

### **1. The Parties**

Complainant is CoorsTek, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Greenberg Traurig, LLP, United States.

Respondent is Eric Jordan, aarq, United States.

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

The disputed domain name <coorsterk.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 25, 2025. On April 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 25, 2025, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on April 28, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on May 3, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 5, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 25, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on May 26, 2025.

The Center appointed Timothy D. Casey as the sole panelist in this matter on June 3, 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 a 115-year-old materials science company that develops technical ceramic material formulations and has manufacturing, sales and research facilities around the world. Complainant has used the COORSTEK trademark for related goods and services since 2000. Complainant utilizes the <coorstek.com> domain name for a website associated with its business. Complainant has registrations in 40 countries for the trademark COORSTEK (the "COORSTEK Marks"), including the following:

Mark	Jurisdiction	Class(es)	Registration No.	Registration Date
COORSTEK	United States	1, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 17, 19, 40 and 42	2,962,220	June 14, 2005

The disputed domain name was registered on December 12, 2024. At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a parking page that features Pay-Per-Click ("PPC") links. Complainant also provided evidence indicating that the disputed domain name was used by or on behalf of Respondent to contact customers of Complainant in an attempt to fraudulently obtain payments from such customers.

#### 5. Parties' Contentions

##### A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, Complainant contends that it has trademark rights, as evidenced above, and that the disputed domain name is virtually identical and confusingly similar to the COORSTEK Marks. Complainant contends that the addition of the letter "r" and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") to the disputed domain name are insufficient to distinguish the disputed domain name from the COORSTEK Marks.

Complainant contends Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, has not used or prepared to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, and has not been authorized, licensed or otherwise permitted by Complainant to register the disputed domain name. Complainant contends that Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to impersonate Complainant and its employees by creating fraudulent email addresses in an attempt to deceive customers of Complainant into paying fraudulent invoices is not a legitimate non-commercial or fair use claim of the disputed domain name and is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Complainant contends that Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith. This is evidenced by Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to obtain payment from and to defraud customers of Complainant. Complainant contends Respondent used a privacy service and used false contact details when registering the disputed domain name as evidenced by the mailing address corresponding to an illegitimate address, both of which evidence bad faith. Complainant further contends that Respondent's activities evidence Respondent's actual knowledge of Complainant's business and the COORSTEK Marks at the time of registration of the disputed domain name.

##### B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the disputed domain name includes a misspelling of Complainant's mark, the addition of the letter "r", the mark remains recognizable. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of "proving a negative", requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here claimed impersonation/passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

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

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that Respondent used false information when registering the disputed domain name, hid some semblance of its true identity behind a privacy service, and proceeded to use the disputed domain name in an attempt to lure customers of Complainant into fraudulently paying money

intended for Complainant to Respondent, all of which intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's mark.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here claimed impersonation/passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Respondent's utilization of false information when registering the disputed domain name and utilization of a privacy service further evidence bad faith registration. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that Complainant has established the third element 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 <coorsterk.com> be transferred to Complainant.

*/Timothy D. Casey/*

**Timothy D. Casey**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 17, 2025