

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Airco Process Technology A/S v. MARIA CAROLINE NEOCLEOUS, Tencaro Services LTD

Case No. D2025-5296

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Airco Process Technology A/S, Denmark, represented by Holst, Advokater Limited Liability Partnership, Denmark.

The Respondent is MARIA CAROLINE NEOCLEOUS, Tencaro Services LTD, Cyprus.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 18, 2025. On December 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On December 19, 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 (“Unknown”, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 22, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on December 26, 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 26, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Gabriela Kennedy as the sole panelist in this matter on February 2, 2026. 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

The Complainant offers decarbonization and biogas-related technology solutions.

The Complainant owns various trademark registrations for the AIRCO PROCESS TECHNOLOGY mark in multiple jurisdictions. The relevant trademark registrations include, inter alia, the European Union Trademark Registration No. 018209974 for AIRCO PROCESS TECHNOLOGY in Classes 5, 7, 11, 37, 40, and 42 registered on June 25, 2020, and the United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00918209974 for AIRCO PROCESS TECHNOLOGY in Classes 5, 7, 11, 37, 40, and 42 registered on June 25, 2020 (collectively, the “Complainant’s Trademark”).

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on April 28, 2025, years after the Complainant registered the Complainant’s Trademark. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name purportedly resolved to an active website that claimed itself as “Airco Process Technology Holding Aps” and advertised its data analytics services (the “Respondent’s Website”). At the time of the rendering of this Decision, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to an inactive website displaying the message “404 Page Not Found”.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

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

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

(a) The Disputed Domain Name is wholly incorporated in the Complainant’s Trademark, with the only differences being the omission of spaces and the addition of the descriptive term “holding”. Such minor alterations and the inclusion of a non-distinctive term do not avoid a finding of confusing similarity, as panels consistently held that a domain name is confusingly similar to the complainant’s mark if such mark is recognizable within the domain name. The addition of “holding” in fact reinforces the impression that the Disputed Domain Name belongs to the holding company within the Complainant’s corporate group.

(b) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant and has not otherwise been authorized to use the Complainant’s Trademark in any other manner. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the Complainant’s Trademark or the name “Airco Process Techno Holding”, nor does it own any trademark rights incorporating the Complainant’s Trademark. The Respondent’s Website claimed to be providing data analytics services under the name of “Airco Process Technology Holding ApS”, which is the parent company of the Complainant. These falsely suggested that the Respondent’s Website is operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant’s corporate group. Such deliberate impersonation and misrepresentation is fundamentally inconsistent with any bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate noncommercial or fair use under the Policy.

(c) The Respondent has registered the Disputed Domain Name and is using it in bad faith. The Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name long after the Complainant adopted and registered the Complainant’s Trademark, and the Complainant’s Trademark is highly specific and not one that the Respondent would legitimately choose without knowledge of the Complainant. By displaying the name of the

Complainant's parent company and the CVR number of that company, on the Respondent's Website, the Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name to impersonate a company within the Complainant's corporate group. The Respondent has also put misleading email address ([...][@aircoprocesstechnoholding.com](mailto:[...]@aircoprocesstechnoholding.com)) that deceives Internet users into believing that they are contacting a staff member of the Complainant's parent company, with an attempt to create confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's Website.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove each of the following three elements:

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

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 the 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.

The 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name. The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the majority part of the Complainant's Trademark "airco process techno" and omitted the letters "logy" in the word "technology". Furthermore, the generic Top-Level Domain in this case ".com" may be disregarded for the purposes of assessing confusing similarity under the first element. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of another term (here, "holding") may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the Complainant's Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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 the 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.

The Panel notes that there is no evidence on the available record to show that the Respondent has trademark rights corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name, or that the Respondent has become commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. The Panel further notes that the Complainant has provided no license or authorization of any kind to the Respondent to use the Complainant's Trademark or to apply for or use any domain name incorporating the Complainant's Trademark. The Respondent would likely not have adopted the Complainant's Trademark if not for the purpose of creating an impression that the Disputed Domain Name is associated with, or originates from the Complainant. The reproduction of the Complainant's Trademark (save for the missing letters "logy") and the addition of the term "holding" in the Disputed Domain Name, as well as the purported use of the Complainant's Trademark on the Respondent's Website also lead to a risk of implied affiliation as the Disputed Domain Name effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant.

There is also no evidence to suggest that the Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name is in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or be regarded as legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The Respondent purportedly used the Respondent's Website to impersonate or pass itself off as the Complainant's parent company, Airco Process Technology Holding ApS, by claiming that it provides data analytics services under the name of such parent company and displaying the Complainant's Trademark on the Respondent's Website. The Respondent's Website attempts to divert business away from the Complainant while capitalizing on the goodwill associated with the Complainant's Trademark.

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

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent has not rebutted the 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.

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 it is difficult to conceive of any plausible use of the Disputed Domain Name by the unaffiliated Respondent that would amount to good faith use, given that the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's Trademark save for the letters "logy" in the word "technology", and that the Respondent's Website purportedly claimed to be the parent company of the Complainant and advertise its data analytics services. The Respondent has registered and used the Disputed Domain Name to mislead and divert Internet users to the Respondent's Website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's Website. Further, the Respondent failed to respond to the Complainant's contentions and has provided no evidence of any actual or contemplated good faith use of the Disputed Domain Name.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed impersonation or passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

The Panel notes that the Disputed Domain Name now resolves to an inactive website. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness of the Complainant's Trademark, the composition of the Disputed Domain Name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the Disputed Domain Name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the 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 <aircoprocesstechnoholding.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gabriela Kennedy/

Gabriela Kennedy

Sole Panelist

Date: February 16, 2026