

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ecolab USA Inc. v. Swapnendu Banerjee, EcoLabs
Case No. D2026-0685

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Ecolab USA Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Greenberg Traurig, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Swapnendu Banerjee, EcoLabs, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ecolabs.tech> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 17, 2026. On February 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 19, 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 (Not provided) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 19, 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 amended Complaint on February 23, 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”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 16, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Anton Polikarpov as the sole panelist in this matter on March 30, 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 large United States transnational corporation specializing in water treatment, hygiene, and infection solutions. It is asserted to be a global leader in industrial and institutional cleaning, providing products, services, and digital tools to businesses rather than consumers.

The Complainant's IP strategy is multi-layered, combining patents, trade secrets, and trademarks across various jurisdictions, notably:

- Australian Trademark No. 453406 for ECOLAB, registered on October 8, 1986, covering goods in Class 5;
- Indian Trademark No. 461913 for ECOLAB, registered on October 17, 1986, covering goods in Class 1;
- United States Trademark No. 1497423 for ECOLAB, registered on July 26, 1988, covering goods and services in Classes 7 and 37;
- United Kingdom Trademark No. UK00001280799 for ECOLAB, registered on December 6, 1991, covering goods in Class 3; and
- International Trademark No. 1180255 for ECOLAB, registered on January 18, 2013, covering goods and services in Classes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 35, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44 and 45.

The aforementioned trademarks are used consistently across the Complainant's commercial activities, in particular within its multi-domain architecture, which comprises over 150 domain names, e.g. <ecolab.in>, <ecolab.net.in>, <ecolab.tech>, as well as the primary one – <ecolab.com>, registered in 1996.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 6, 2025. In the past, the website under the disputed domain name offered tailor-made technical solutions for business needs, in particular with the help of AI tools. The website also advertised for interns to join "Eco Labs", with a contact email address containing the disputed domain name posted on the website. On this matter, the cease and desist letter was sent to the Respondent by the Complainant's counsel on January 6, 2026, to which it received no response. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive website.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant believes that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name, i.e.:

- the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademarks in which the Complainant has established rights;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In order to prevail, the Complainant has to prove each of the three elements set out in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

According to paragraph 5(f) of the Rules, "[i]f a Respondent does not submit a response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute based upon the complaint". Paragraph 14(b) of the Rules provides that "[i]f a Party, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, does not comply with any provision of, or requirement under, these Rules or any request from the Panel, the Panel shall draw such inferences therefrom as it considers appropriate".

In view of the lack of the response, despite the opportunity to do so within the established term, the Panel rules as follows.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

In this case, the Complainant has clearly demonstrated its rights to the ECOLAB marks in various jurisdictions, which is sufficient for the purposes of standing to file a UDRP case (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.2.1).

The disputed domain name differs from the Complainant's marks by only one letter, "s", which has been tacked on at the end.

In the Panel's view, the addition of the letter "s" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity as the trademark remains recognizable.

Further, it is well established that ".tech", as a generic Top-Level Domain, may be disregarded in the assessment of the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademarks (see the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1; *LEGO Juris A/S v. Henry Jufri, Bayao Studio*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-2246](#)).

For the reasons set out above, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the ECOLAB mark and the first element is deemed to be established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

As stated in the Complaint: (i) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name; (ii) has not used or prepared to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; and (iii) has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to register and/or use the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds the Complainant has established the prima facie case, so the burden of production shifts to the Respondent.

However, the Respondent did not take advantage of the opportunity to demonstrate any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name in line with paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

The Complainant is well known internationally and the disputed domain name is almost identical to the ECOLAB marks and the Complainant's official domain name <ecolab.com>.

While the Panel notes that the disputed domain name can be seen as a combination of dictionary terms, the Panel finds that, in the circumstances of this case – namely, the Complainant's long-standing use of the ECOLAB trademark and its online presence, the use of the disputed domain name to purportedly offer sustainability solutions for businesses – although it remains unclear whether any services have actually been rendered and the website lacks information on the nature of such services – which is also an important component of the Complainant's business, and the absence of any response, the Panel finds it more probable than not that the disputed domain name was registered in the knowledge of the Complainant's mark and with intent to target it.

Further, the registrant organization identified in the registration details of the disputed domain name is "EcoLabs" (as such, differs in one letter from the Complainant's company name), however, there is no evidence before the Panel that the Respondent is actually commonly known as EcoLabs.

Therefore, the Panel finds, on balance, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in relation to the disputed domain name; consequently, the second element has also been satisfied.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Here, the Complainant's trademark rights predate the registration of the disputed domain name for more than 30 years. The Complainant has supplied evidence that it is a well known product and service provider, including within the field of sustainability.

Additionally, the Panel agrees with previously made findings in the sense that the ECOLAB marks are well known (see e.g. *Ecolab USA Inc. v. wangchao hui*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0688](#); and *Ecolab USA Inc. v. Mckenna Cummerata*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-5178](#)).

It means that the Respondent more likely than not knew or should have known about the ECOLAB marks at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, which indicates bad faith.

As described in section 6B. of this Decision, it is hard to say exactly about the reality of services provided in connection with the disputed domain name. That is why there are no circumstances, which could satisfy the Panel that the disputed domain name is used for legitimate business. If the Respondent were operating a legitimate business focused on sustainability under the name "Eco Labs", which appeared to be actively recruiting, the Panel would expect a response from the Respondent documenting this business activity. In the absence of such a response, the Panel infers that the disputed domain name is almost identical to the Complainant's trademark and was used to offer services in the sustainability field in which the Complainant also operates. Further, given the totality of the circumstances, the current inactive status of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith and rather reinforces the finding that there was no good faith intention behind the registration and prior use of the disputed domain name.

Given the widespread and longstanding reputation of the Complainant, the Panel finds that the only purpose of the Respondent is to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the ECOLAB marks as to the source, sponsorship or affiliation.

What is more, the Respondent did not respond to either this Complaint, or to the Complainant's counsel cease and desist letter, sent directly to the email address listed on the website at the disputed domain name and through the Registrar's form. In this case, evaluating all the circumstances, the Panel considers that the Respondent's failure to reply further supports a finding of bad faith (see *Societe des Produits Nestle SA v. Deleting domain, Umbeke Membe*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-0738](#)).

Taking into account all the arguments presented, the disputed domain name was more likely than not registered and is being used in bad faith. In other words, the Complainant succeeded under the third element.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraph 4(i) of the Policy and paragraph 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name, <ecolabs.tech>, be transferred to the Complainant.

/Anton Polikarpov /

Anton Polikarpov

Sole Panelist

Date: April 11, 2026