

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Solvay S.A. v. Angel07 Mercy, Green Pasture Inc
Case No. D2024-2178

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Solvay S.A., Belgium, represented by Novagraaf Belgium NV/SA, Belgium.

The Respondent is Angel07 Mercy, Green Pasture Inc., United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <solvay-th.com> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 28, 2024. On May 28, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 29, 2024, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the 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 June 4, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 24, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 26, 2024.

The Center appointed Cristian, L. Calderón Rodríguez as the sole panelist in this matter on July 1, 2024. 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 is a Belgian company, founded in 1863, specialized in high performance polymers and composites technologies and a leader in chemical products. The Complainant is present in more than 60 countries and has 22,000 employees worldwide.

The Complainant is owner of thousands of trademarks worldwide from which more than 800 containing the mark SOLVAY inter alia the following trademark registrations:

- European Union Trade Mark registration No. 000067801 for SOLVAY, registered on May 30, 2000;
- European Union Trade Mark registration No. 011664091 for SOLVAY, registered on August 13, 2013;
- Philippine Trademark registration No. 1171614 for SOLVAY, registered on July 31, 2014; and
- Thailand trademark registration No. 415374 for the word mark SOLVAY registered since April 12, 2016.

Further, the Complainant is the holder of inter alia the domain name <solway.com>, registered since 1995.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 14, 2024, and does not resolve to an active website.

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:

1. the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks as it includes the Complainant's trademark SOLVAY in its entirety followed by the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com";
2. the addition of the gTLD ".com" to the disputed domain name does not avoid confusing similarity;
3. the Respondent has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name or own any trademark corresponding to the disputed domain name;
4. the Respondent has not been licensed or authorized to use the trademark SOLVAY or any domain name including this trademark;
5. the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests to use and register the disputed domain name as the Complainant has prior and exclusive rights on the name "Solvay";
6. the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website demonstrating that the Respondent is not using the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services;
7. the degree of reputation of the Complainant's trademarks and activities are such that the Respondent could not ignore the existence of the Complainant's prior rights; and
8. the fact that the Respondent has chosen as a domain name a known trademark is a clear indication that the use and registration of the disputed domain name was made in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the 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 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.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, the additional term of "-th" would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element, which may however bear on assessment of the second and third elements. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7 and section 1.8.

The applicable gTLD in a domain name (e.g. ".com", ".club", ".nyc") is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, 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.

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.

Furthermore, the Panel finds that because the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's SOLVAY trademark any use of such domain name by the Respondent carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Based on the available record, 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 finds that it is more likely than not that the Respondent had knowledge of the existence of the Complainant and its prior rights.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or “coming soon” page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the non-use of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this proceeding. Although panelists will look at the totality of the circumstances in each case, factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant’s mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, and (iii) the respondent’s concealing its identity or use of false contact details (noted to be in breach of its registration agreement). [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, the failure of the Respondent to submit a response 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.

Based on the available record, 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 <solvay-th.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Cristian, L. Calderón Rodríguez /
Cristian, L. Calderón Rodríguez
Sole Panelist
Date: July 15, 2024