

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

HMS Industrial Networks AB v. Steve Moore
Case No. D2026-2140

1. The Parties

The Complainant is HMS Industrial Networks AB, Sweden, represented by Abion AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Steve Moore, United States ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <hms-networksus.com> is registered with Register.com (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 18, 2026. On May 19, 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 (PERFECT PRIVACY, LLC) 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 an amended Complaint on May 21, 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 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 16, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Alvaro Loureiro Oliveira as the sole panelist in this matter on June 23, 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, HMS Industrial Networks AB, is a Swedish company founded in 1996 and headquartered in Halmstad, Sweden. It develops and supplies industrial information and communication technology solutions, with a particular focus on industrial automation and Industrial Internet of Things (“IIoT”) applications. The Complainant conducts business internationally through subsidiaries, distributors and commercial partners in numerous jurisdictions and maintains an established online presence through its corporate website and related digital platforms.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for the mark HMS in several jurisdictions. For purposes of the present proceedings, it is sufficient to refer to European Union Trademark Registration No. 019084413 for HMS, registered on April 19, 2025, and International Registration No. 1861239 for HMS, registered on March 25, 2025. The Complainant has also operated domain names incorporating its HMS mark for many years, including <hms-networks.com>, registered on September 11, 2000, as well as a number of corresponding country code and generic Top-Level Domain registrations.

The disputed domain name <hms-networksus.com> was registered on March 16, 2026. At the time the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name did not resolve to an active website. The evidence also shows that Mail Exchange (“MX”) records had been configured for the disputed domain name.

It further appears from the record that, shortly before the filing of the present Complaint, the Complainant prevailed in a separate UDRP proceeding concerning the domain name <hms-networks-us.com> registered by the Respondent (*HMS Industrial Networks AB v. Steve Moore*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-1418](#)).

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its HMS trademark, which is reproduced in its entirety, the additional terms “networks” and “us” being insufficient to dispel the confusing similarity. According to the Complainant, those terms instead reinforce the impression that the disputed domain name refers to its business operations, particularly its activities in the United States.

The Complainant further submits that it has never authorized the Respondent to use its HMS trademark or to register any domain name incorporating that mark. It asserts that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, has acquired no trademark rights corresponding to it, and has not used the disputed domain name in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services or for any legitimate noncommercial purpose.

Finally, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In support of this contention, it relies on the composition of the disputed domain name, the passive holding of the corresponding website, the existence of active MX records, and the similarities between the disputed domain name in the present proceedings and the domain name that formed the subject of *HMS Industrial Networks AB v. Steve Moore, supra*.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must establish that: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which it has rights; (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 has considered the parties' submissions, the documentary evidence on record, the Policy, the Rules, and the consensus views reflected in the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)").

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The evidence establishes that the Complainant owns registered trademark rights in the mark HMS.

The disputed domain name reproduces that mark in its entirety. The additional terms "networks" and "us" do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The applicable generic Top-Level Domain (".com") is a standard registration requirement and is disregarded for purposes of the comparison under the first element of the Policy. The Complainant's trademark remains readily recognizable within the disputed domain name. The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

Accordingly, the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy identifies a number of circumstances capable of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. None of those circumstances are present on the record of this case.

The Complainant has stated that it has never authorized the Respondent to use its HMS trademark or to register any domain name incorporating that mark. There is likewise no evidence that the Respondent has ever been commonly known by the disputed domain name or by any corresponding name.

Nor does the record disclose any use, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. At the time the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name resolved to an inactive webpage, and nothing before the Panel suggests any legitimate commercial or noncommercial activity associated with it.

The composition of the disputed domain name further supports the conclusion that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. By combining the Complainant's distinctive trademark with the dominant aspect of its corporate identity and a geographical reference corresponding to one of the markets in which the Complainant operates, the disputed domain name conveys the appearance of an official online location connected with the Complainant, also noting the confusing similarity between the Complainant's domain name <hms-networks.com> and the disputed domain name. In the circumstances of this case, such composition is inherently inconsistent with a claim of fair or legitimate use.

Once the Complainant has established these circumstances, the burden of production shifted to the Respondent to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent, has, however, elected not to participate in these proceedings and has therefore failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The second element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has therefore been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The circumstances surrounding the registration of the disputed domain name point convincingly to deliberate targeting of the Complainant. The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's HMS trademark in its entirety, immediately followed by the term "networks", corresponding to the dominant aspect of the Complainant's corporate identity and longstanding Internet presence, and concludes with the geographical abbreviation "us" where the Complainant also operates its businesses. Viewed as a whole, this composition strongly suggests an intention to target the Complainant and its business. The Panel is therefore satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant and its trademark rights in mind.

The absence of any credible explanation for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name is relevant not only to the assessment of rights or legitimate interests, but also to the determination of bad faith under the third element of the Policy.

The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website. This circumstance, however, does not preclude a finding of bad faith. As reflected in section 3.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), passive holding does not prevent a finding of bad faith where the totality of the circumstances demonstrates that no plausible good-faith use of the disputed domain name may reasonably be envisaged.

Those circumstances are present here. The Respondent selected a domain name closely mirroring the Complainant's commercial identity and domain name, has provided no explanation for such choice, has made no demonstrable legitimate use of the disputed domain name, and configured MX records. Although the existence of MX records is not, by itself, conclusive evidence of abusive conduct, it assumes particular significance when considered together with the composition of the disputed domain name and the surrounding circumstances of the case.

Viewed as a whole, the evidence supports no plausible inference other than that the disputed domain name was registered with the Complainant's trademark and commercial identity specifically in mind and has been passively held in circumstances amounting to bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel further notes that the Complainant was recently successful in a separate proceeding under the Policy concerning the domain name <hms-networks-us.com> registered by the Respondent (*HMS Industrial Networks AB v. Steve Moore, supra*). Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of bad faith conduct pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The third element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has therefore 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 <hms-networksus.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Alvaro Loureiro Oliveira/

Alvaro Loureiro Oliveira

Sole Panelist

Date: July 7, 2026