ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Meridian Plumbing Co., Inc. v. Curran Van Waarde
Case No. D2026-1294

1. The Parties

Complainant is Meridian Plumbing Co., Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Hawley Troxell Ennis & Hawley LLP, United States.

Respondent is Curran Van Waarde, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <meridianplumbingco.com> (the "Domain Name") is registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 25, 2026. On March 26, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On March 27, 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 (NAME REDACTED FOR PRIVACY DYNADOT PRIVACY SERVICE SUPER PRIVACY SERVICE LTD C/O DYNADOT) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email to Complainant on March 30, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on April 4, 2026.

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 28, 2026. Respondent sent an email to the Center on April 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Robert A. Badgley as the sole panelist in this matter on May 6, 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 plumbing company based in Idaho, United States.

Complainant holds a registered trademark for MERIDIAN PLUMBING, United States Reg. No. 5,421,636, registered on March 13, 2018 in connection with "residential and commercial plumbing services" with an April 1, 1985 date of first use in commerce.

The Domain Name was registered on February 16, 2026. The Domain Name currently does not resolve to an active website. For a time, however, the Domain Name resolved to a website offering plumbing services. The website indicated that the services were allegedly delivered by "Meridian Plumbing Co".
According to Complainant:

"The Respondent's website presently appears to offer services that are identical to and compete with the Complainant's services."

In his April 8, 2026, email to the Center, Respondent stated:

"I am the Respondent in the above-referenced case regarding the domain [name] [<meridianplumbingco.com>]. I would like to settle this matter and am willing to transfer the domain [name] to the Complainant. Please let me know the next steps and I will sign the Standard Settlement Form."

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not substantively reply to Complainant's contentions but sent the above-referenced email communication asserting its willingness to transfer the Domain Name.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists the three elements which Complainant must satisfy with respect to the Domain Name:

(i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; and
(ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
(iii) the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel finds that Complainant has rights in the trademark MERIDIAN PLUMBING through registration demonstrated in the record. The Panel also finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to that mark.

The Domain Name is comprised entirely of the mark plus the letters “co”. In the Panel’s view, the mark remains clearly recognizable within the Domain Name notwithstanding these additional letters.

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(i).

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, Respondent may establish its rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, among other circumstances, by showing any of the following elements:

(i) before any notice to you [Respondent] of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
(ii) you [Respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the Domain Name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
(iii) you [Respondent] are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The Panel concludes that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. Respondent has not come forward to articulate any bona fide basis for registering the Domain Name. The undisputed record here indicates that Respondent has used the Domain Name for a website offering services identical to those offered by Complainant under the latter’s registered trademark and using Complainant’ company name to identify the purported provider of the services. Such a use cannot be regarded as conferring on Respondent rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name (this is true even though the term “plumbing” is disclaimed in the relevant mark).

Complainant has established Policy paragraph 4(a)(ii).

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides that the following circumstances, “in particular but without limitation,” are evidence of the registration and use of the Domain Name in “bad faith”:

(i) circumstances indicating that Respondent has registered or has acquired the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Domain Name registration to Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of its documented out of pocket costs directly related to the Domain Name; or
(ii) that Respondent has registered the Domain Name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that Respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
(iii) that Respondent has registered the Domain Name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
(iv) that by using the Domain Name, Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent’s website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent’s website or location or of a product or service on Respondent’s website or location.

The Panel concludes, on the record provided here, that Respondent has registered and used the Domain Name in bad faith. The Panel incorporates its discussion above in the “Rights or Legitimate Interests” section. The undisputed record supports the conclusion that Respondent more likely than not targeted Complainant’s mark for purposes of diverting customers to Respondent’s site for commercial gain, in violation of the above-quoted Policy paragraph 4(b)(iv).

Complainant has established 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 Domain Name <meridianplumbingco.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Robert A. Badgley/
Robert A. Badgley
Sole Panelist
Date: May 15, 2026