

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Molex, LLC v. Katherine Booth
Case No. D2026-0249

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Molex, LLC, United States of America ("US"), represented by KHerrick LLC, US.

The Respondent is Katherine Booth, US.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <molexelectronics.com> is registered with Squarespace Domains LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on January 21, 2026. On January 22, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 23, 2026, 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 January 23, 2026, 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 amendment to the Complaint on January 27, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on the same day.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 29, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 18, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any formal response. The Center notified the Parties that it would proceed to panel appointment on February 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Dennis A. Foster as the sole panelist in this matter on February 24, 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 has been using the MOLEX trademark in connection with the sale of electronics products since about 1939. The Complainant's main website is at the domain name <molex.com>.

The Complainant is the owner of the following US trademark registrations for its MOLEX trademark:

- Registration No. 797096, Registration Date: October 5, 1965, Int. Class: 9, Goods: electrical components including terminals, plates, and blocks with fittings, separable connectors and switches and parts therefor;
- Registration No. 6302812, Registration Date: March 23, 2021, Int. Classes: 9 and 11, Goods: lighting systems and led lighting.
- Registration No. 2126860, Registration Date: January 6, 1998, Int. Classes: 7 and 9, Goods: machines for producing and handling electrical components.

The Respondent is an individual who registered the disputed domain name on April 30, 2024. The disputed domain name redirects visitors to the Complainant's own "www.molex.com" website, and the Respondent used it for creating an email address to send out emails regarding orders and payments for the Complainant's products, using the name of one of the Complainant's employees. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to do this.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

- The disputed domain name includes the Complainant's MOLEX trademark.
- There is no active website associated with the disputed domain name.
- The Respondent sends emails from the disputed domain name to the Complainant's potential customers while impersonating one of the Complainant's employees.
- The disputed domain name does not relate to any goods or services offered by the Respondent, but instead relates to the Complainant's own goods and services.
- The Respondent is not making a legitimate offering of goods or services at the disputed domain name.
- The Respondent is not making a noncommercial use or a fair use of the disputed domain name.
- The Respondent appears to have registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the Complainant's business and, for financial gain, to defraud the Complainant's customers by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its trademark.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Pursuant to Policy paragraphs 4(a)(i) - (iii), the Panel may render a decision for the Complainant and grant a transfer of the disputed domain name, if the Complainant shows that:

- The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has exhibited copies of several of its MOLEX trademark registrations. The Panel finds this proves that the Complainant has trademark rights in MOLEX. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.2.1.

The Panel observes that in the disputed domain name the Respondent has added the term "electronics" to the Complainant's MOLEX trademark. Per the UDRP panel consensus, the Panel finds the Complainant's trademark is readily recognizable, and therefore the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.8.

The Panel finds, then, that the Complainant has carried its burden of proof under Policy paragraph 4(a)(i) to show that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Per UDRP panel consensus, it might be difficult for a complainant to prove that a respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. Inter alia, this is because of the logical difficulty of "proving a negative", and because of the likelihood that much of the needed evidence is held by the Respondent. Therefore, it usually is sufficient for the Complainant to make out a prima facie case, and then it is up to the Respondent to come forward with evidence to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case, although the overall burden of proof remains on the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

In the present case, the Complainant contends that the Respondent does not have permission to use the Complainant's US registered trademark in the disputed domain name. The Complainant also contends that the Respondent is passing herself off as the Complainant and purporting to sell the Complainant's goods to the Complainant's customers for money payable to the Respondent. The Panel finds the Complainant thusly has made out a prima facie case that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having not responded to the Complainant's contentions, the Respondent has not come forward with evidence showing that she indeed does have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Nonetheless, the Panel will examine the case record to see if there might be evidence tending to show that the Respondent does have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name as allowed under Policy paragraphs 4(c)(i), (ii) and (iii).

Under Policy paragraph 4(c)(i), the Respondent would have to show that, before receiving notice of this proceeding, she was using the disputed domain name to make a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent has in fact been using the disputed domain name to redirect to the Complainant's own website as well as to impersonate the Complainant. The Panel finds this is a bad faith use, not a bona fide offering of goods or services. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 2.5.3, and 2.13.1.

As the Complainant contends, the Panel also finds the Respondent has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name as allowed under Policy paragraph 4(c)(ii), and has not been using the disputed domain name for a noncommercial use or a fair use per Policy paragraph 4(c)(iii). The Respondent herein clearly is intent on financial gain.

Ergo, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name per Policy paragraph 4(a)(ii).

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Policy at paragraph 4(b) provides four non-exclusive grounds on which a Respondent may be found to have registered and to be using a disputed domain name in bad faith. In the case at hand, the Respondent registered a domain name confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark and requested that payments be sent to bank accounts in which the Respondent presumably had an interest. This violates the bad faith provisions of the Policy at paragraph 4(b)(iv). The Panel finds that the Respondent targeted the Complainant because she took care to identify the Complainant's employee and the Complainant's commercial partners, and the Respondent was familiar with the Complainant's products.

The Panel also finds the Respondent violated the bad faith provisions of Policy paragraph 4(b)(iii) because she had to have realized she was being disruptive to the Complainant's business.

Finally, the Panel finds that the Respondent is in bad faith because she went so far as to pass herself off as the Complainant's employee in dealing with the Complainant's commercial partners. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4: "Many such cases involve the respondent's use of the domain name to send deceptive emails, e.g., to obtain sensitive or confidential personal information from prospective applicants, or to solicit payment of fraudulent invoices by the complainant's actual or prospective customers." See *Accor v. SANGHO HEO /Contact Privacy Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-1471](#) where the Panel found "...that Respondent intentionally attempted to deceive consumers into providing personal and financial information, believing that Respondent was associated with the bona fide services offered by Complainant."

In summary, the Panel finds that the Complainant has carried its burden of proof to show that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith per Policy paragraph 4(a)(iii).

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 <molexelectronics.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Dennis A. Foster/

Dennis A. Foster

Sole Panelist

Date: March 6, 2026