

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SYENSQO S.A. v. Steve Shannon

Case No. D2025-3905

1. The Parties

The Complainant is SYENSQO S.A., Belgium, represented by Fencer BV, Belgium.

The Respondent is Steve Shannon, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <syensqo.com> is registered with Wild West Domains, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 25, 2025. On the same day, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 26, 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 September 26, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint both 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 October 1, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 21, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 23, 2025.

The Center appointed Ada L. Redondo Aguilera as the sole panelist in this matter on October 28, 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, Syensqo S.A., formerly part of Solvay S.A., is a technology company specializing in advanced materials and chemical solutions. Following its demerger from Solvay S.A., the Complainant adopted the name SYENSQO in December 2023 and filed several trademark applications relating to the SYENSQO trademark and logo.

The Complainant owns the following trademark registrations:

Jurisdiction	Trademark	Filing No. / Date	Registration No. / Date	Classes
European Union	SYENSQO	018888334 / June 14, 2023	018888334 / October 31, 2024	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 17, 24, 30, 37, 40, 42
France	SYENSQO	4969218 / June 13, 2023	4969218 / December 8, 2023	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 17, 24, 30, 37, 40, 42
France	SYENSQO (and logo)	4983280 / August 8, 2023	4983280 / December 4, 2023	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 17, 24, 30, 37, 40, 42

The Complainant also owns several domain names registrations incorporating the SYENSQO trademark, including <syensqi.com> and <syensqk.com>, which display their official website.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name <syenssqo.com> on September 15, 2025, which is currently inactive.

5. Parties Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its SYENSQO trademark, as it incorporates the mark in its entirety with an additional letter “s” (typosquatting). The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and the Complainant argues that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

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 disputed domain name incorporates the trademark with a minor addition of one letter, which constitutes typosquatting and does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9).

Although this typosquatting may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that such addition of a letter does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

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

Regarding the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" in the disputed domain name, it is well established that a gTLD does not generally affect the assessment for the purpose of determining identity or confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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's lack of 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 that 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 their rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

In the present case, the Complainant points a domain name that is similar and almost identical to a third party's trademark. In such a case, the disputed domain name appears intended to, and does, play on the coined trademark of the Complainant.

According to the evidence presented in the present case, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. In addition, the disputed domain name is nearly identical to the Complainant's trademark. Lastly, the Complainant emphasizes that it has not authorized or licensed the use of its trademarks or any similar sign to third parties, including to the Respondent.

The Complainant made a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. The Respondent failed to rebut this presumption ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1).

Therefore, 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, which 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.

As such, the Panel finds that the Respondent's decision to register the disputed domain name, confusingly similar to the Complainant's coined trademark, reflects both the Respondent's specific targeting of the trademark (which several prior URDP panels have recognized as distinctive – see, for instance, the *SYENSQO S.A. v. Phil Bennett*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4723](#) and *Syensqo S.A. v. 任艺伟 (Yi Wei Ren)*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4743](#)). Therefore, in the present case the Panel considers that the Complainant's SYENSQO trademark is distinctive and has a strong reputation; there is no response from the Respondent. In the Panel's view, the implication is that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with a view to taking unfair advantage of the Complainant's rights in the trademark.

The Respondent's registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar to the Complainant's well-known trademark demonstrates targeting and intent to capitalize on its reputation, and in the present case, the disputed domain name is not in use (passive holding). The Panel finds that even passive holding may constitute bad faith when combined with other factors, see *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#). The current non-use of the disputed domain name does not change the Panel's finding of the Respondent's bad faith in this case, noting in particular the nature of the Complainant's trademark and composition of the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in 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 <syenssqo.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ada L. Redondo Aguilera/

Ada L. Redondo Aguilera

Sole Panelist

Date: November 11, 2025