

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Particle Measuring Systems Inc. v. Name Redacted Case No. D2026-0461

1. The Parties

Complainant is Particle Measuring Systems Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Name Redacted.¹

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <pmeasuringsystems.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 4, 2026. On February 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 5, 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on February 5, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on February 17, 2026.

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”).

¹ The Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent’s name from this decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding, and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 10, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 11, 2026. The Center appointed Lorelei Ritchie as the sole panelist in this matter on March 17, 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 multinational company based in the United States. For decades prior to the registration of the disputed domain name, Complainant has offered environmental monitoring instruments and related products under the mark PARTICLE MEASURING SYSTEMS. Complainant is the owner of several registrations for its PARTICLE MEASURING SYSTEMS mark, including United States Registration No. 3,397,110 (registered March 18, 2008) and European Union Trade Mark No. 011512324 (registered October 25, 2014). Complainant also owns registrations for a shortened version of its mark, PMS. These registrations include United States Registration No. 6,130,491 (registered August 18, 2020) and European Union Trade Mark No. 014534549 (registered August 28, 2019). Complainant further owns registrations for domain names that incorporate variations of its PARTICLE MEASURING SYSTEMS and PMS marks. These include <pmeasuring.com> (registered March 11, 1995), which Complainant uses to connect with prospective consumers online.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 28, 2025. Respondent has used the URL associated with the disputed domain name to redirect users to Complainant's own website. At the time the Complainant was filed, the URL resolved to a blank webpage.

Respondent provided the Registrar with false contact information that identified an actual employee of Complainant.

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 PARTICLE MEASURING SYSTEMS mark as well as the shortened version of this mark, PMS. Complainant contends that the products offered by Complainant under these marks are "backed by over 60 active patents" which has led to Complainant's position as a "leader in cleanroom and process monitoring technologies" in the "over 50 countries" where Complainant operates.

Complainant further contends that Respondent has incorporated into the disputed domain name the dominant portion of Complainant's PARTICLE MEASURING SYSTEMS and PMS marks, which is likely to confuse consumers looking for Complainant's official website. Complainant contends that confusion is exacerbated by Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to re-direct to Complainant's own website as well as by Respondent's false listing of an actual employee of Complainant as the registrant, in an apparent identity theft. Complainant asserts that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name, and rather has registered and is using it in bad faith, presumably for Respondent's own commercial gain.

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 Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7. Complainant has shown rights in respect of the marks, PARTICLE MEASURING SYSTEMS and PMS, for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. Incorporating the "dominant feature" of a mark or combining the elements of a complainant's marks is sufficient for a finding under this first element of the UDRP where, as here, the marks remain sufficiently recognizable in the disputed domain name. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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 3.1](#), section 2.1. Complainant has provided evidence that the disputed domain name has been used to redirect users to Complainant's own website without authorization and with false contact information in an apparent identity theft. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, including identity theft or other types of fraudulent use, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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. As noted in Section 4 of this Panel's decision, the record includes evidence that Respondent has used the URL associated with the disputed domain name to re-direct to Complainant's own website, and that Respondent has further provided false information to the Registrar, purporting to be an actual employee of Complainant, in an apparent identity theft. The Panel thus finds sufficient evidence that Respondent was aware of Complainant's rights and Complainant's marks at the time of registering the disputed domain name and used the dispute domain name to create a likelihood of confusion with Complainant.

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 <pmeasuringsystems.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Lorelei Ritchie/

Lorelei Ritchie

Sole Panelist

Date: March 26, 2026