

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Dentsply Sirona Inc. v. wanglan wang  
Case No. D2025-3226

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Dentsply Sirona Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Schwegman Lundberg & Woessner, P.A., United States.

The Respondent is wanglan wang, China.

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

The disputed domain name <cavitronofficial.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 August 12, 2025. On August 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 13, 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 Registrant / REDACTED FOR PRIVACY (DT), Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 13, 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 amendment to the Complaint on August 13, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 August 15, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 4, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 5, 2025.

The Center appointed Halvor Manshaus as the sole panelist in this matter on September 12, 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**

The Complainant is a dental supply company, formed in 2016 through the merge of a New-York-based company founded in 1899 and a German company founded in Erlangen in 1877. Following the merger, the Complainant has grown into the world's largest manufacturer of professional dental products and technologies, with operations in more than 40 countries and sales presence in more than 120 countries.

The Complainant owns several registered trademarks worldwide for marks containing or consisting of CAVITRON in association with its dental instruments, including.

- The United Kingdom trademark registration number UK00902209815, registered on June 20, 2002, for various goods in class 10;
- The United States trademark registration number 620009, registered on January 24, 1956, for various goods in class 10; and
- The United States trademark registration number 2649452, registered on November 12, 2002, for various goods in class 10.

The Complainant also operates the domain name <cavitrondental.com> registered on September 11, 2013.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 31, 2025. It resolves to a website titled "Cavitron® Dental, Ultrasonic Scaler, Dental Scaler, Machine Tips, Official Website", displaying the Complainant's trademark and purporting to offer dental instruments under the Complainant's brand.

#### **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 the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety and was registered over 70 years after the Complainant first used its trademark, and 69 years after the Complainant's first trademark registration. The addition of the descriptive term "official" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity with the Complainant's trademark, it increases the likelihood of confusion that the disputed domain name is operated by the Complainant.

Further, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has never licensed or authorized the Respondent to use its trademark, nor is there any connection between the Parties. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor does it hold any trademark or service mark rights to it. The disputed domain name reverts to a website displaying the Complainant's trademark and where dental products are offered under the Complainant's brand, and as such, the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services. The website hosted on the disputed domain name contains errors, non-functioning product links, and inactive social media buttons, showing that the website has not been created with intent of comprising a genuine, customer-facing website.

Finally, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant asserts that its trademark has acquired a strong reputation and goodwill in many countries, well before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. The Respondent has also used a privacy service to register the disputed domain name, indicating bad faith. Further, the inclusion of the term “official” in the disputed domain name increases the likelihood of confusion, misleading Internet users into believing the domain name is the Complainant’s legitimate website. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion to the Complainant’s trademark for commercial gain.

## **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.

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 entirety of the mark is reproduced 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 addition of other terms here, “official”, may bear on 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 mark 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.

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 disputed domain name hosts a webpage using the Complainant's trademark, giving the impression that it is the official website of the Complainant. As a result, the Respondent takes advantage of the goodwill and reputation associated with the Complainant's brand. Such use cannot be considered legitimate.

In the Panel's view, the presented evidence referred to by the Complainant is sufficient to establish a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Panel has not been presented with, or discovered, any evidence that (i) the Respondent has received a license or other permission to use the Complainant's trademark or any domain name incorporating this mark; (ii) the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name; (iii) the Respondent has acquired trademark rights in the terms comprising the disputed domain name; or (iv) the Respondent is making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

As such, 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.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, and that the Complainant's registration of its trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain name. The Panel therefore finds it unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's right to the trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain name. Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Respondent had or should have had knowledge of the Complainant's trademark registrations.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying the Complainant's trademark, offering products branded with the Complainant's trademark and indicating that it is an "official website" in connection with the Complainant's products. The Panel further finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the intention to cause confusion among Internet users, which demonstrates bad faith.

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 <cavitronofficial.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Halvor Manshaus/*

**Halvor Manshaus**

Sole Panelist

Date: September 26, 2025