

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Malvern Panalytical Limited v. Kokopi Kpokii, Ambles
Case No. D2025-4294

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Malvern Panalytical Limited, United Kingdom, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Kokopi Kpokii, Ambles, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <malvernpanalytical.com> is registered with GMO Internet, Inc. d/b/a Discount-Domain.com and Onamae.com (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 20, 2025. On October 21, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 22, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 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 October 27, 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 October 28, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 17, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 19, 2025.

The Center appointed Adam Samuel as the sole panelist in this matter on November 24, 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 United Kingdom company manufacturing advanced sensors and other instruments used to measure and analyse materials. It owns a number of trademarks for MALVERN PANALYTICAL, including United Kingdom registration no. 00917025354, registered on November 24, 2017. The disputed domain name was registered on April 28, 2025. The Complainant uses the domain name <malvernpanalytical.com> registered on December 14, 2016, to market its products and services.

Currently, the disputed domain name resolves to a page that reads: "This domain name has expired. If you are the registered holder of this name and wish to renew it, please contact your registration service provider." The Complainant has provided evidence that the disputed domain name has been used to send email communications purporting to come from the Complainant.

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 dispute domain name contains a misspelling by the addition of an 'l' to the Complainant's well-known MALVERN PANALYTICAL trademark. The disputed domain name is similar to the Complainant's trademark in both sight and sound. The applicable Top-Level Domain ("TLD") in a domain name should be disregarded under the confusing similarity test.

The Respondent is not associated or affiliated with the Complainant. The Complainant has not granted any rights to the Respondent to use the MALVERN PANALYTICAL mark. The Respondent is not commonly known by the dispute domain name.

The Respondent has sent emails from the disputed domain name to give the impression that they come from the Complainant's purchase manager and impersonate an employee of the Complainant. These emails contain the Complainant's address and logotype. The Respondent has demonstrated its knowledge of the Complainant. Typosquatting is also evidence of bad faith registration. The Respondent has also ignored the Complainant's attempts to resolve this dispute.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied:

(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; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's trademark with two letters "l" instead of one and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com". The gTLD is irrelevant here as it is a standard registration requirement. See section 1.11.1 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)").

Section 1.9 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) says:

"A domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. This stems from the fact that the domain name contains sufficiently recognizable aspects of the relevant mark."

Here, the insertion of the second "l" in the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Respondent is not called "malvern panalytical" or anything similar. There is no evidence that the Complainant has ever authorised the Respondent to use its trademarks. The Respondent appears to have used the disputed domain name to email potential customers, using the Complainant's trademark MALVERN PANALYTICAL and address for this purpose.

For these reasons, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has met this element. See section 2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Respondent has been using the Complainant's trademark and address on its emails in order to impersonate the Complainant. That is evidence of bad faith for the purposes of the Policy. When it did this, it knew who the Complainant was and presumably did so when it registered the disputed domain name.

This conclusion is reinforced by the fact that this is a clear typosquatting case. Section 1.9 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) says:

"Under the second and third elements, panels will normally find that employing a misspelling in this way signals an intention on the part of the respondent (typically corroborated by infringing website content) to confuse users seeking or expecting the complainant."

For all these reasons, 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 <malvempanalytical.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Adam Samuel/

Adam Samuel

Sole Panelist

Date: November 24, 2025