

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Molecor Tecnología, S.L. v. mesut erdogan
Case No. D2025-1909

1. The Parties

Complainant is Molecor Tecnología, S.L., Spain, represented by PONS IP, Spain.

Respondent is mesut erdogan, Türkiye.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <silkwormbymolecor.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 13, 2025. On May 13, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 14, 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 / REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on May 20, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed the amended Complaints on June 22, 2025, and June 26, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 amended Complaints, and the proceedings commenced on May 27, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 16, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on June 23, 2025.

The Center appointed Stephanie G. Hartung as the sole panelist in this matter on June 25, 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 company organized under the laws of Spain that is specialized in infrastructure, sanitation and building solutions.

Complainant has provided evidence that it is the registered owner of several trademarks relating to its MOLECOR company name and brand, inter alia, but not limited to, the following:

- word/design trademark MOLECOR, European Union Intellectual Property Office (“EUIPO”), registration number: 006643969, registration date: January 21, 2009, status: active;
- word/design trademark MOLECOR, International registration (World Intellectual Property Organization (“WIPO”)), registration number: 1576363, registration date: January 15, 2021, status: active.

Also, Complainant has demonstrated that it has applied for and/or registered several trademarks relating to its newly introduced SILKWORM BY MOLECOR brand, including e.g., the following:

- word/design trademark SILKWORM BY MOLECOR, EUIPO, filing number: 19165840, filing date: April 1, 2025, status: active;
- word/design trademark SILKWORM BY MOLECOR, EUIPO, filing number: 19173115, filing date: April 15, 2025, status: active;
- word/design trademark SILKWORM BY MOLECOR, WIPO, registration number: 1860049, registration date: April 30, 2025, basic application: April 15, 2025, status: active.

Moreover, Complainant has demonstrated to own since 2006 the domain name <molecor.com> which resolves to Complainant’s main website at “www.molecor.com”, promoting Complainant’s products, e.g., pipes and related fittings internationally.

Respondent, according to the registrar verification, is located in Türkiye. The disputed domain name was registered on April 1, 2025, and it is offered on the Internet for online sale at a price of USD 2,988.

Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to Complainant.

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 was founded back in 2006 and has experienced exponential growth and continuous improvement ever since in order to market nowadays its pipes and fittings in more than 30 countries around the world.

Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant’s MOLECOR trademark (which is a fancy word with no meaning) and even identical to Complainant’s SILKWORM BY MOLECOR trademark (which is completely integrated in the disputed domain name). Moreover, Complainant asserts that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since (1) Respondent lacks any license and/authorization to provide sales or other services under Complainant’s MOLECOR and/or SILKWORM BY MOLECOR trademarks, and (2) Respondent has not created any website under the disputed domain name indicating any kind of legitimate interest therein, but

rather offers the latter for purchase. Finally, Complainant argues that Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith since (1) Complainant is a well-established company in the piping and sanitation sector with first trademark registrations dating back to 2008, (2) Complainant operates its email accounts through the domain name <molecor.com> which was registered back in 2006, (3) there is reason to presume that Respondent's purpose to register the disputed domain name is no other than to impersonate Complainant's employees in order to deceive Complainant's customers, as demonstrated by several parallel UDRP proceedings relating to the domain names <molecorr.com> as well as <molecor.cam> in which same Respondent used those domain names for email purposes in order to divert payments to be made to Complainant for the provision of services to its clients to another bank account, and (4) the disputed domain name was registered on April 1, 2025, being exactly the same day on which the European Union trademark SILKWORM BY MOLECOR (filing number: 19165840) was applied for.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, Complainant carries the burden of proving:

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

Respondent's default in the case at hand does not automatically result in a decision in favor of Complainant, however, paragraph 5(f) of the Rules provides that if Respondent does not submit a response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute solely based upon the Complaint. Further, according to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences from Respondent's failure to submit a Response as it considers appropriate.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

First, 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 MOLECOR trademarks 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 its MOLECOR trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

Also, the entirety thereof is reproduced within the disputed domain name, simply added by the terms "silkworm" and "by". Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's MOLECOR trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. Although the addition of other terms (here, "silkworm" and "by") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and Complainant's MOLECOR trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel, therefore, holds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Second, 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.

Respondent has not been authorized to use Complainant’s MOLECOR trademarks, either as a domain name or in any other way. Also, there is no evidence to consider that Respondent’s name would somehow correspond with the disputed domain name and Respondent does not appear to have any trademark rights associated with the fancy term “molecor” on its own. Finally, Respondent so far obviously has neither used the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services nor for a legitimate noncommercial or fair purpose, but rather to offer it on the Internet for sale at a price of USD 2,988. UDRP panels have recognized that holding a domain name for resale can be bona fide and is not per se illegitimate under the UDRP (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1), but have also found that the mere registration of such a domain name does not by itself automatically confer rights or legitimate interests (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.10.1). Moreover, given that the disputed domain name incorporates both the undisputedly recognized MOLECOR trademark as well as the newly applied SILKWORN BY MOLECOR trademark in their entirety, the disputed domain name carries, as such, a high risk of implied affiliation with Complainant and its trademarks which is why offering the disputed domain name for online sale cannot constitute fair use and, thus, cannot confer rights or legitimate interests therein (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1).

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Third, 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.

It is undisputed between the Parties that Complainant’s MOLECOR trademarks enjoy a certain level of recognition due to Complainant’s exponential growth and continuous improvement ever since its foundation in 2006, nowadays marketing its pipes and fittings in more than 30 countries around the world. Also, the Panel has well recognized the temporal coincidence of the registration of the disputed domain name on April 1, 2025, and the filing and/or registration of Complainant’s SILKWORN BY MOLECOR trademarks between April 1, 2025, and April 30, 2025. These circumstances, further, suggest the conclusion that Respondent was well aware of Complainant and its existing rights in the MOLECOR trademarks and the nascent rights in the SILKWORN BY MOLECOR trademarks when registering the disputed domain name and that the latter is directly targeting such trademarks. Given the fact that so far the disputed domain name apparently has not been used for any other purpose but to be offered on the Internet for a sales price of USD 2,988, it is reasonable to argue that Respondent registered the latter primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring it to Complainant who is the owner of those trademarks for valuable consideration in excess of Respondent’s documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name, which, in turn, constitutes evidence of Respondent’s bad faith according to paragraph 4(b)(i)

of the Policy. In this context, and particularly in relation to Complainant's SILKWORN BY MOLECOR trademark applications, UDRP panels are ready to prepare to find that a respondent has acted in bad faith even in cases when the disputed domain name was registered only in anticipation of nascent trademark rights if the facts of the case establish that respondent's intent in registering the disputed domain name was to unfairly capitalize thereon (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.8.2.).

The Panel, therefore, holds that Complainant has established the third element of the Policy, too.

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, <silkwormbymolecor.com>, be transferred to Complainant.

/Stephanie G. Hartung/

Stephanie G. Hartung

Sole Panelist

Date: July 7, 2025