

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Huron Industries, Inc. v. Domain Admin
Case No. D2025-5310

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Huron Industries, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by CreatiVertical LC, United States.

The Respondent is Domain Admin, United States, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <neosafe.com> is registered with DropCatch.com LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on December 18, 2025. On December 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 22, 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 January 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 28, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on January 28, 2026.

The Center appointed W. Scott Blackmer as the sole panelist in this matter on February 2, 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

The Complainant is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Michigan, United States and headquartered in Port Huron, Michigan, United States. The Complainant produces oil sorbent powders and industrial safety products and states that it has done so under the NEOSAFE mark since at least early 2022. The Complainant operates a website at “www.neolube.com” headed “Huron,” with a page devoted to its “NEOSafe™ Sorbent Powder”, which is used to clean up spills “in Industrial and Food-Safe Environments”. The Complainant’s website is linked to its Facebook and LinkedIn social media pages. The Complaint attaches archived images of its website and product packaging displaying the NEOSAFE mark.

The Complainant holds United States trademark registration number 7050585 for the word mark NEOSAFE (registered on May 9, 2023) in international classes 1 and 3.

The disputed domain name was created on February 17, 2024, and is registered in the name of “Domain Admin”, listing no organization, a postal address in the State of California, United States, and an Outlook contact email address. The disputed domain name redirects to a landing page hosted by Atom.com advertising the disputed domain name for sale.

A Response was submitted by A. P. of California, United States, stating that he acquired the disputed domain name via the Registrar’s expired domain name auction platform on February 20, 2024, for USD 1,113.

In November and December 2025, the Complainant attempted to purchase the disputed domain name through Atom.com but balked at the price requested (initially USD 28,000). The Complainant then messaged that NEOSAFE is a registered trademark and that only the Complainant could “legally” use it in commerce, offering between USD 1,500 and USD 2,000 “for a quick transfer” “without unnecessary escalation”. The Respondent replied, “Our registration and use of this domain name are not in any way against your rights,” counteroffering to sell the disputed domain name for USD 14,000. This proceeding followed.

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 identical to the Complainant’s registered NEOSAFE trademark and that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because it is not commonly known by a corresponding name, has never been authorized to use the Complainant’s mark, and does not use the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Complainant argues that the Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain name after the Complainant acquired trademark rights was in bad faith, as was the Respondent’s listing the domain name for sale for an excessive price and persisting to demand such a price after receiving explicit trademark notices.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied all of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent denies prior knowledge of the Complainant or its mark. He states that he acquired the disputed domain name because of its “inherently valuable descriptive meaning”, combining “neo” (meaning “new”) and “safe”, in a domain name with potential “commercial appeal for a wide range of businesses”. The

Respondent attaches supporting evidence that other businesses use the term “neosafe” in their business, product, and domain names, including extracts from the WIPO Global Brand Database displaying multiple NEOSAFE, NEO-SAFE, and NEO SAFE marks in various jurisdictions and various classes of goods and services, as well as Internet screenshots advertising products and services such as “NEOSAFE safety shoes”, “NEOSAFE ELEVATOR”, “NEOSAFE MARKETING”, “NEO SAFE STORAGE SOLUTIONS”, “NEOSAFEFX Investment Plans”, “Neosafe Healthcare”, “neosafe Soluções de Seguro”, “NEOSAFE AGTECH”, and “NeoSafe Ltd (Uganda)”. The Respondent asserts that buying and selling domain names based on descriptive terms is a legitimate business and points out that he did not initiate contacts with the Complainant.

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 (the registered NEOSAFE word mark) for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical 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.

Because a respondent in a UDRP proceeding is in the best position to assert rights or legitimate interests in a domain name, it is well established that after a complainant makes a prima facie case, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence of its rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1. The Complainant has established trademark rights, a lack of permissive use, and the fact that the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name for a commercial website but merely offered it for sale. Thus, the Complainant has made a prima facie case, and the burden of production shifts to the Respondent.

The Respondent claims a legitimate interest in pursuing his business of buying and reselling “generic and descriptive” domain names such as the disputed domain name that may be useful “for a wide range of businesses”. The disputed domain name is in fact composed of two dictionary terms, and the Response documents the fact that many businesses use the same combination of terms, including a search of the WIPO Global Brand Database revealing several pages of registered trademarks combining these terms, most of them owned by companies other than the Complainant. As reflected in the discussion in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.10.1, domain names composed of dictionary words and phrases have potential value to many users for non-trademark reasons, and a domain investor such as the Respondent may demonstrate a credible intent which does not capitalize on the reputation and goodwill inherent in the complainant’s mark.

The Panel finds, therefore (subject to the assessment of bad faith in the following section) that, before notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the Respondent had a legitimate interest in holding and advertising the disputed domain name for resale for its inherent value in connection with the dictionary sense of its combined elements.

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 the Complainant assumes bad faith in the registration and use of the disputed domain name because the Respondent registered the disputed domain name after the Complainant acquired trademark rights and then advertised the disputed domain name for sale for an “excessive price”. The Complainant’s assumptions are all dubious. The Complainant’s mark itself is a combination of two dictionary words, and the Respondent amply demonstrates that many other businesses use that same combination, including as registered trademarks, to label their products or services, in other classes and jurisdictions. Contrary to the Complainant’s claim in its message to the Respondent quoted above, then, the Complainant is not the only party that can “legally” use the term “neosafe” in a domain name. Moreover, the Respondent denied prior knowledge of the Complainant, and this claim is plausible. The Complainant’s NEOSAFE products are for industrial not consumer use, and the Complainant does not have a “neosafe” domain name; its NEOSAFE-branded products are advertised on a page on its website at “www.neolube.com”. The Panel notes further that the top Internet search results for “neosafe” all concern businesses other than the Complainant.¹ Thus, the Panel finds no compelling reason to disbelieve the Respondent’s denial of prior awareness of the Complainant and of an intent to exploit the Complainant’s trademark. The sales price listed by the Respondent for the disputed domain name could very well reflect its perceived value to any of multiple businesses using a corresponding name.

Hence, the evidence in the case file as presented does not establish that the Respondent’s aim in registering the disputed domain name was to profit from or exploit the Complainant’s trademark.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has not been established.

On the same facts, the Panel confirms its finding on the second element of the Policy above.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/W. Scott Blackmer/

W. Scott Blackmer

Sole Panelist

Date: February 16, 2026

¹Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”) section 4.8.