

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Tyco International Services GmbH v. Market Countryview  
Case No. D2025-4643

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Tyco International Services GmbH, Switzerland, represented by Neal & McDevitt, United States of America (the “United States”).

The Respondent is Market Countryview, United States.

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

The disputed domain name <te-connectivity.com> is registered with Network Solutions, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 7, 2025. On November 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 10, 2025, 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 November 20, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 10, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 11, 2025.

The Center appointed David Stone as the sole panelist in this matter on December 18, 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 the exclusive licensor to TE Connectivity, a global technology company that designs and manufactures electrical products across a range of industry sectors. TE Connectivity has a global workforce of approximately 90,000 employees and serves customers in approximately 140 countries.

The Complainant owns, among others, the following trademark registration for TE CONNECTIVITY - United States trademark no. 4,538,111 registered on May 27, 2014 in international classes 7, 8, 9, 17, 37 and 38 (the “Mark”).

The Complainant’s official domain names are <teconnectivity.com> and <teconnectivity.org>.

On July 24, 2024, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name <te-connectivity.com>, which currently has active mail exchange servers associated with it. At the time of this decision, the disputed domain name returns no data.

#### **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.

The Complainant contends, under the first element, that the disputed domain name incorporates the Mark in its entirety and the only difference, other than the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”), is a hyphen between the “TE” and “CONNECTIVITY” elements of the Mark. The presence of a hyphen and the addition of the gTLD in the disputed domain name does not eliminate the confusing similarity between the Mark and the disputed domain name.

Under the second element, the Complainant contends that there has never been any relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent (or the Complainant’s exclusive Licensee and the Respondent) that would give rise to any license, sponsorship, permission or authorization to use or register the disputed domain name. It is further contended that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, which shows a lack of rights or legitimate interests.

Under the third element, the Complainant contends that even though the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website, the totality of the circumstances shows bad faith: the Mark enjoys global recognition and is uniquely associated with the Complainant’s goods and services offered through its exclusive licensee; the Respondent has provided false contact information; and there is no plausible legitimate or good-faith use for a domain name that is so close to the Complainant’s distinctive marks. It is also contended that the Respondent has also configured mail exchange servers for the disputed domain name, which indicates an intent to use the disputed domain name for sending and receiving emails and suggests a risk of deceptive email communication, including impersonation, phishing, or fraud, aimed at misappropriating the Complainant’s reputation or misleading third parties.

##### **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 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.

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 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 notes that: (i) the Complainant's exclusive licensee is a sizeable business and the Complainant's Mark is likely well known; (ii) the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name which is confusingly similar (indeed, it is nearly identical to) the Mark; (iii) the disputed domain name differs from one of the Complainant's official domain names by just a hyphen between "TE" and "CONNECTIVITY"; (iv) the disputed domain name has active mail exchange servers associated with it, giving rise to the potential for fraudulent emails; (v) the Respondent has provided false contact information; and (vi) the Respondent has not submitted a response to the Complaint.

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.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and/or reputation of the Complainant's Mark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, 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.

Further, the Respondent has not attempted to refute the Complainant's contentions, which casts additional doubt on the nature of its conduct. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

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 <te-connectivity.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/David Stone/*

**David Stone**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 2, 2026