

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sealed Air Corporation (US) v. Rachel Baptista
Case No. D2025-5054

1. The Parties

Complainant is Sealed Air Corporation (US), United States of America, (“United States”), represented by Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough, LLP, United States.

Respondent is Rachel Baptista, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sealeclair.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 December 5, 2025. On December 5, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 8, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information (“Unknown”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on December 9, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant submitted an amended Complaint on December 9, 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 15, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 4, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on January 6, 2026.

The Center appointed Lorelei Ritchie as the sole panelist in this matter on January 29, 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

Complainant is a publicly traded company based in the United States. For decades prior to the registration of the disputed domain name, Complainant has offered packaging products under the mark SEALED AIR. Complainant is the owner of several registrations for its SEALED AIR mark. These include, among others, United States Registration Nos. 925,912 (registered December 21, 1971) and 1,580,890 (registered February 6, 1990).

The disputed domain name was registered on November 24, 2025. Although the disputed domain name does not appear to resolve to an active website, Respondent has used it to set up an email address to purportedly impersonate Complainant in communications requesting sensitive personal and financial information. According to Complainant, Respondent has no affiliation with Complainant, nor any license to use its marks.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks, (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Specifically, Complainant contends that it owns rights to the SEALED AIR mark, which Complainant has used for decades for its various packaging solutions, traded on the New York Stock Exchange under the label "SEE", and for which Complainant has recorded 5.4 billion USD in revenue in FY2024. Complainant contends that Respondent has incorporated Complainant's well-known mark into the disputed domain name, with only a slight misspelling intended to confuse consumers and partners seeking to connect with Complainant online.

Complainant further contends that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and rather has registered and is using it in bad faith, having simply acquired the disputed domain name for Respondent's own commercial gain. In particular, Complainant asserts that Respondent has set up an email address associated with the disputed domain name, which Respondent has used in an attempt to impersonate Complainant, and seeking sensitive personal and financial information.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to 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. Complainant has shown rights in respect of the mark SEALED AIR for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. The Panel finds that the misspelling of the Complainant's trademark, replacing the letter "d" with the visually similar letters "cl", by Respondent does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and Complainant's mark for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

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 that Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, including phishing activity as here, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds that Complainant has provided sufficient evidence of Respondent’s lack of “rights or legitimate interests” in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, which Respondent has not rebutted.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

There are several ways that a complainant can demonstrate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith. UDRP panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. As noted in Section 4, above, Respondent has set up an email address associated with the disputed domain name, which Respondent has used in a phishing attempt to impersonate Complainant in communications requesting sensitive personal and financial information. Moreover, the classic typosquatting composition of the disputed domain name further supports a finding of bad faith in these circumstances.

Therefore, the Panel finds sufficient evidence that Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith for purposes of paragraph (4)(a)(iii) 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 <sealeclair.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Lorelei Ritchie/

Lorelei Ritchie

Sole Panelist

Date: February 6, 2026