ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Delrin USA LLC v. Miriam Kecir, delrin
Case No. D2026-2197

1. The Parties

Complainant is Delrin USA LLC, United States of America ("USA"), represented by Com Laude Limited, United Kingdom.

Respondent is Miriam Kecir, delrin, USA.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <delrin.online> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 21, 2026. On May 21, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 21, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on May 27, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on May 28, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 1, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 21, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on June 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Michael A. Albert as the sole panelist in this matter on July 1, 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 – Delrin USA LLC – is an advanced materials company headquartered in Wilmington, Delaware, USA. Complainant's primary product Delrin acetal homopolymer has been produced by Complainant for more than 70 years. Complainant was devested from DuPont de Nemours, Inc. ("DuPont") in November 2023 following acquisition of a majority stake in that business by TJC L.P., a private equity firm.

Complainant manufactures and supplies high-performance acetal homopolymer resins for use in a range of industrial and commercial applications, including mobility, electronics, healthcare, consumer products and industrial systems. Complainant has global presence, including local subsidiaries in Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, United Kingdom, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Switzerland, China, Japan, and Republic of Korea.

Complainant operates its official corporate website from the domain name <delrin.com>, which Complainant uses for, inter alia, email communications.

Complainant is the owner of a large global portfolio of registered trademarks for the term DELRIN, including the four examples below:

Trademark no.	Mark	Jurisdiction	Registration date
597795	DELRIN	USA	November 9, 1954
UK00000759394	DELRIN	United Kingdom	November 8, 1956
DD620596	DELRIN	Germany	June 22, 1957
TMA107175	DELRIN	Canada	June 28, 1957

Complainant notes that the oldest of its example DELRIN marks pre-dates the registration of the disputed domain name by more than 71 years.

The disputed domain name has been used to impersonate Complainant's employees and send phishing emails.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, Complainant contends that Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith. In particular, Respondent used the disputed domain name to send phishing emails, impersonating Complainant's employees.

Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name is identical to registered trademarks in which Complainant has rights in terms of the Policy.

Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name resolves to the email hosting provider's parking page which, Complainant contends, constitutes passive holding.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

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 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.

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 addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".online" does not alter this analysis. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity – here, claimed phishing and passing off – 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, although other circumstances may also 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that Respondent used the disputed domain name to impersonate the employee of Complainant in a phishing scheme. Respondent used email addresses associated with the disputed domain name to impersonate Complainant in an attempt to collect financial and payroll information. Respondent, having failed to respond at all, has not denied this assertion. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity – here, claimed phishing and passing off – constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. The Panel finds Respondent's use of the disputed domain name for this phishing scheme constitutes bad faith.

The Panel finds that 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 <delrin.online> be transferred to Complainant.

/Michael A. Albert/
Michael A. Albert
Sole Panelist
Date: July 16, 2026