

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Spectris plc v. James Desmond

Case No. D2025-4924

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Spectris plc, United Kingdom, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is James Desmond, United States of America (“United States”).

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

The disputed domain name <spectrls.com> is registered with Name SRS AB (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 26, 2025. On November 26, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 27, 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 (Protected, Shield Whois) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 1, 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 December 5, 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 December 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 30, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 6, 2026.

The Center appointed Mihaela Maravela as the sole panelist in this matter on January 8, 2026. 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**

According to information in the Complaint, the Complainant was founded in 1915, and is a leading provider of precision instrumentation and controls. It has approximately 7,600 employees globally, and it is listed on the London Stock Exchange under symbol "SXS".

The Complainant is the owner of national and international trademark registrations worldwide for SPECTRIS (word mark), including the following:

- European Union Trademark Registration No. 14362305, registered on December 17, 2017, in classes 9, 35 and 42;
- International Trademark Registration No. 643248, registered on August 18, 1995, in class 9, duly renewed;
- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00002019909, registered on January 19, 1996, in class 9, duly renewed;
- Canadian Trademark registration No. TMA524922, registered on March 15, 2000, in classes 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11, duly renewed.

The Complainant maintains a strong Internet presence, predominantly through its primary domain name <spectris.com>, registered since December 15, 1998.

The Respondent is reportedly an individual located in the United States.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 26, 2025, and does not resolve to an active website.

#### **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 a purposeful misspelling of the Complainant's SPECTRIS trademark – as the disputed domain name varies from the Complainant's trademark by only one letter, namely the Respondent has removed the letter "i" from SPECTRIS and replaced it with the letter "l" - and must be considered confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

As regards the second element, the Complainant argues that the Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant in any way. Nor has the Complainant given the Respondent permission to use the Complainant's trademarks in any manner, including in domain names. Furthermore, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to a website that resolves to a blank page and lacks content. Therefore, the Respondent has failed to make use of the disputed domain name which evinces a lack of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

With respect to the third element, the Complainant submits that it and its SPECTRIS trademark are known internationally, with trademark registrations across numerous countries. The Complainant has registered and has been using this trademark since 1995, which is well before the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name on August 26, 2025. At the time of registration of the disputed domain name, the

Respondent knew, or at least should have known, of the existence of the Complainant's trademarks. Further, the disputed domain name is a typosquatted version of the Complainant's SPECTRIS trademark and has intentionally been designed to closely mimic the Complainant's trademark and primary domain name. As regards the use, the disputed domain name currently resolves to an inactive site and is not being used, but the disputed domain name can only be taken as intending to cause confusion among Internet users as to the source of the disputed domain name. In addition to the disputed domain name, the Respondent currently holds registrations for several other domain names that misappropriate the trademarks of well-known brands and businesses. This fact demonstrates that the Respondent is engaging in a pattern of cybersquatting/typosquatting, which is evidence of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

No response has been received from the Respondent in this case. Accordingly, the Panel considers it can proceed to determine the Complaint based on the statements and documents submitted by the Complainant as per paragraph 15(a) of the Rules. The applicable standard of proof in UDRP cases is the "balance of probabilities" or "preponderance of the evidence", and the Panel can draw certain inferences in light of the particular facts and circumstances of the case. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.2. Concerning the uncontested information provided by the Complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the reasonable factual allegations in the Complaint as true. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.3.

Even if the Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's contentions, the Complainant still bears the burden of proving that all requirements are fulfilled. 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**

Under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that it has rights to a trademark, and that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to that trademark. This first element under the Policy functions primarily as a standing requirement. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the trademark SPECTRIS for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

As regards the second limb of the first element, the test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. It is well established that the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") may be ignored when assessing the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademarks as they are viewed as a standard registration requirement. See section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name which incorporates the obvious misspelling of the SPECTRIS trademark of the Complainant, with the substitution of the letter "i" in the trademark by the similar-appearing letter "l". This misspelling in the disputed domain name also referred to as typosquatting, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9).

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's 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.

There is no evidence in the record that the Respondent is currently using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor does the Respondent appear to engage in any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraphs 4(c)(i) and (iii) of the Policy. The Respondent is an individual named "James Desmond" and there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. The Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's contentions, claiming any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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.

According to the unrebutted assertions of the Complainant, its SPECTRIS trademarks were widely used in commerce well before the registration of the disputed domain name and are reputed. The disputed domain name is a misspelled version of the Complainant's trademark. Under these circumstances, it is most likely that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark at the registration date of the disputed domain name. The Respondent provided no explanations for why he registered the disputed domain name.

With regards to the use, the disputed domain name is passively held. 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

reputation of the Complainant's trademark, 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. Moreover, the Respondent has not formally participated in these proceedings and has failed to rebut the Complainant's contentions and to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use and indeed none would seem plausible.

Moreover, the Complainant has shown that the Respondent is the owner of numerous other domain names, including domain names that appear to incorporate third parties' trademarks. Hence, it appears to the Panel that the Respondent has shown a pattern of conduct of speculative domain name registration. In this Panel's view, whether the domain names incorporate third party marks precisely, or instead some confusingly similar misspelling thereof, matters not for the purposes of deciding whether there is a pattern of conduct on the Respondent's part.

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 <spectrls.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Mihaela Maravela/*

**Mihaela Maravela**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 16, 2026