

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Spectris Limited v. Ashley Wang

Case No. D2026-1892

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Spectris Limited, United Kingdom, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Ashley Wang, United States of America (the “United States”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <spectris.dev> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 1, 2026. On May 1, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On May 4, 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 (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 4, 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 May 8, 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 May 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 28, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Marilena Comanescu as the sole panelist in this matter on June 4, 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

Founded in 1915, the Complainant is a worldwide provider of precision instrumentation and controls. The Complainant's group of companies offers a range of specialist high-tech instruments, test equipment and software. The Complainant has approximately 7,600 employees globally, and it was listed on the London Stock Exchange, being also a component of the FTSE 250 (Financial Times Stock Exchange 250 Index).

The Complainant holds numerous worldwide trademark registrations for or including SPECTRIS, such as the following:

- the International Trademark Registration number 643248 for SPECTRIS (word), registered on August 18, 1995, designating numerous jurisdictions worldwide and covering goods in International Class 9;
- the European Union Trademark Registration number 014362305 for SPECTRIS (word), filed on July 15, 2015, registered on December 17, 2017, covering goods and services in International Classes 9, 35, 42; and
- the Canadian Trademark Registration number TMA524922 for SPECTRIS (word), filed on May 25, 1998, registered on March 15, 2000, covering goods in International Classes 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11.

The Complainant owns over a hundred domain names incorporating the SPECTRIS mark, the main one being <spectris.com>, registered on December 15, 1998, and which receives thousands of unique visitors each month, for example this website received over 31,404 visits in October 2025.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on February 23, 2026 and, at the time of filing the Complaint, it resolved to a website featuring the name "Spectris Collective" and stating that "Spectris is a student software development and research organization". No active button is available, and no information about the operator of this website or its contact details is displayed.

The Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent on March 26, 2026, followed by reminders in April, through the Registrar's contact form. No reply was received.

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 Complainant and its trademark are known internationally, with trademark registrations across numerous countries;
- the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the SPECTRIS trademark;

- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name; the Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or permitted the Respondent to use its trademarks in any manner, including in domain names; there is no evidence that the Respondent has been or was commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, nor making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name;

- the Respondent has registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith in particular because: (i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the Complainant's well-known SPECTRIS trademark; (ii) the registration of the Disputed Domain Name significantly postdates the Complainant's trademark registration and use; (iii) given the Complainant's numerous trademark registrations for SPECTRIS, and its extensive international reputation, also given that the Google search results for "spectris" reveal mostly the Complainant and its trademark, it is not possible to conceive of a plausible situation in which the Respondent would have been unaware of the Complainant and its well-known SPECTRIS trademarks, and the only feasible explanation for the Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name is that the Respondent intends to cause confusion, mistake and deception by means of the Disputed Domain Name; (iv) the Respondent had employed a privacy service to hide its identity; and (v) the Respondent failed to respond to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letters.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove on the balance of probabilities that:

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

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. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 3.1](#), 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 the 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.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel notes the composition of the Disputed Domain Name which reproduces identically the Complainant's trademark and is highly similar to its domain name. Such fact, together with the other circumstances in this case, including the lack of any disclaimer on the website under the Disputed Domain Name and any explanation for the choice of Disputed Domain Name by the Respondent, do not amount to a bona fide offering or legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

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 Disputed Domain Name was registered in bad faith, most likely with knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark particularly because the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's trademark exactly, and the use of the SPECTRIS trademark predates the registration of the Disputed Domain Name by about 30 years and acquired reputation in its industry. Further on, the Disputed Domain Name is highly similar to the Complainant's domain name.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

According to the evidence provided in the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name was used in connection with a website apparently providing student software development and research collective under the name "Spectris Collective".

Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy provides that the use of a domain name to intentionally attempt "to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent's] web site or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the respondent's] web site or location or of a product or service on [the respondent's] website or location" is evidence of registration and use in bad faith.

Given that the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's trademark exactly, and the website operated under the Disputed Domain Name displays no disclaimer, indeed in this Panel's view, the Respondent has intended to attract Internet users accessing the website corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name who may be confused and believe that such website is held, controlled by, or somehow affiliated with or related to the Complainant, likely for the Respondent's commercial gain or for a nefarious purpose.

The Panel further notes the distinctiveness and international reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the Respondent's failure to provide a response in this procedure and to the Complainant's letters, and finds that, in the circumstances of this case, such facts support further evidence of bad faith.

Previous UDRP panels have found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a widely known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can, by itself, create a presumption of bad faith for the purpose of Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1.](#), section 3.1.4.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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, <spectris.dev>, be transferred to the Complainant.

/Marilena Comanescu/

Marilena Comanescu

Sole Panelist

Date: June 9, 2026