ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Molecor Tecnología, S.L. v. adaddds
Case No. D2026-2071

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Molecor Tecnología, S.L., Spain, represented by PONS IP, Spain.

The Respondent is adaddds, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <molecor.org> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 14, 2026. On May 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 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 (Redacted for Privacy, Dynadot Privacy Service, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 20, 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 amended Complaints on May 24, 2026, and May 29, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 June 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 22, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Federica Togo as the sole panelist in this matter on June 29, 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

It results from the Complainant's undisputed allegations that is a Spanish company founded in 2006 and specialized in infrastructure, sanitation and building solutions, whose pipes and fittings are marketed in more than 30 countries around the world. It has eight production centers and four commercial offices around the world. The five plants are located in Spain. Its international presence is in Richards Bay (South Africa) through a Joint Venture (JV) established in 2016 with Sizabantu. It has a presence in Kuantan (Malaysia) through the participation in a PVC-Oriented factory with three production lines established in 2014. And finally, the Latin American factory based in Asuncion (Paraguay), the Molecor-Titan Consortium. In addition, the Complainant has three trading companies: Molecor Maroc, Molecor Peru and Molecor France.

The Complainant is the registered owner of several trademarks worldwide containing and/or consisting of "molecor", e.g., European Union trademark registration no. 006643969, registered on January 21, 2009, for goods and services in classes 17, 19 and 42; Moroccan National Trademark Registration No. 147825 MOLECOR (word), with application date October 31, 2012 registered for products of class 7.

In addition, it owns and uses for its official website the domain name <molecor.com>, registered on June 5, 2006.

The disputed domain name <molecor.org> was registered on April 13, 2026, and resolves to an error webpage, showing the following: "This site can't be reached". Furthermore, the evidence provided by the Complainant proves that the disputed domain name was used to contact third party via email, while pretending to be a Complainant's employee, seemingly in order to obtain improper payment.

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 disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademarks MOLECOR since it reproduces entirely the Complainant's word element of its MOLECOR trademarks.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the Respondent was not known as "Molecor" prior to the registration of the disputed domain name, nor is it currently known as "Molecor"; Respondent lacks any prior trademark rights protecting the distinctive sign MOLECOR. The Respondent also lacks any license and/or authorization to provide sales or other services under Complainant's trademark. The Respondent has not created a website under the disputed domain name. The only purpose is to mislead Complainant's consumers by using the disputed domain name through its email address "[…]@molecor.org" to send them emails where the Respondent states a new bank account where the clients must make their payments, a bank account which clearly does not belong to the Complainant, and therefore, being said activity as an illegal one.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to the Complainant, it is a well-established company in the piping and sanitation sector. The disputed domain name has been registered in order to commit fraud against the Complainant's clients, as it results from an email sent from the disputed domain name. The Respondent has registered the disputed domain name with the sole purpose of impersonating the Complainant and misleading the Complainant's clients making them believe that they are indeed making payments to the Complainant when of course they are not. The email address used for sending the email shows how the disputed domain name is being used in connection with the real identity of the Complainant, impersonating him for fraudulent purposes. The Respondent, when registering the disputed domain name did so in bad faith, because it chose that name precisely because it is identical to the Complainant's trademark MOLECOR, as well as to the domain name used by the Complainant, in order to impersonate him to perform fraudulent activities such as the one described above, trying to obtain financial revenues by misleading consumers making them believe that the payment for the services and goods provided by the Complainant must be made to a bank account which belongs to the Respondent.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable". Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires a complainant to prove each of the following three elements in order to obtain an order that each disputed domain name be transferred or cancelled:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel will therefore proceed to analyze whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied.

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.

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.

It is true that said trademark is a figurative trademark, containing a design element. However, although it is acknowledged that also such figurative marks would satisfy the requirement that a complainant show "rights in a mark", panels would tend to focus on the non-design elements for purposes of assessing confusing similarity. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.10.

The above test typically involves a side-by-side comparison of the domain name and the textual components of the relevant trademark to assess whether the mark is recognizable within the domain name. In the case at hand, the entirety of the mark's textual component "molecor" is reproduced within the disputed domain name <molecor.org>. 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 a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving that 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.

Moreover, the Panel notes that the nature of the disputed domain name carries a high risk of implied affiliation, since the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark textual component "molecor". Generally speaking, previous UDRP panels have found that domain names identical to a complainant's trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation (see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1). The Panel shares this view.

Moreover, the evidence indicates that the disputed domain name has been used for a fraudulent email scheme aimed to impersonate the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, phishing, passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

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.

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.

As explained above, it results from the undisputed evidence submitted by the Complainant that the disputed domain name, which is identical to the Complainant's trademark and domain name, has been used for sending a fraudulent email in the name of an alleged employee of the Complainant in order to obtain improper payment. Such use of the disputed domain name additionally demonstrates that the Respondent not only knew of the Complainant, its business and mark, but also attempted to pass itself off as the Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, passing off, phishing, or other types of fraud) constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element 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 <molecor.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Federica Togo/
Federica Togo
Sole Panelist
Date: July 10, 2026