

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Metrex Research LLC v. Alex Harrison
Case No. D2026-2395

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Metrex Research LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Wood Herron & Evans LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Alex Harrison, Ireland.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <thecaviwipes.com> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 2, 2026. On June 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 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 (Redacted for Privacy Purposes, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 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 June 9, 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 June 11, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 1, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 3, 2026.

The Center appointed Richard C.K. van Oerle as the sole panelist in this matter on July 9, 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 is a manufacturer of disinfectants and sanitizing solutions and has used and currently uses the mark CAVIWIPES.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for CAVIWIPES including in the United States, including Trademark Registration Number 5,473,234, filed May 4, 2017, claiming a first use in commerce since at least as early as March 1, 2001, and registration issued on May 22, 2018, covering protection in class 05: disposable sanitizing wipes and towelettes impregnated with disinfecting chemicals for use by healthcare professionals in hospitals, surgical centers, neonatal units, laboratories, medical and dental operatories.

The registration has been duly renewed and is still valid. The registration will be referred to as the "Trademark".

The Complainant owns the domain names <caviwipes.com> and <metrex.com>, the latter hosting the subpage "www.metrex.com/en-int/surface-disinfectants/caviwipes".

The disputed domain name was registered on October 2, 2025 by the Respondent and it directs to a website that features the Complainant's Trademark and the Trademark as a logo, and images of the Complainant's products, that are purportedly offered for sale. Clicking on the products redirects the visitor to the product offering page in the Amazon marketplace on the website at <amazon.com>.

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 wholly incorporates the Trademark with the minor addition of the word "the." This is sufficient to establish confusing similarity for the purposes of the Policy.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no relationship with, and has never been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to use the disputed domain name, the Trademark, or any confusingly similar mark. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent is not an authorized distributor, reseller, or affiliate of the Complainant.

The Complainant also alleges that the Respondent is not using, and has not made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, the Respondent is alleged to use the Trademark on the website associated with the disputed domain name, where visitors are invited to purchase products bearing the CAVIWIPES Trademark and other trademarks owned by the Complainant. The Complainant further asserts that the website contains links directing users to third-party websites offering products bearing those trademarks.

Finally, the Complainant maintains that the Respondent has never been commonly known by the disputed domain name and has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of it.

The Complainant contends that the Trademark is distinctive and exclusively associated with the Complainant, rather than being descriptive or a common term. The disputed domain name was registered several years after the Complainant had established and registered its trademark rights, and the Respondent therefore registered the disputed domain name with actual or constructive knowledge of the Trademark and its associated goodwill.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name in connection with a website containing links to third-party commercial websites offering the Complainant's genuine products. The Complainant alleges that the Respondent intentionally seeks to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website. In support of this contention, the Complainant states that the website displays the CAVIWIPES and CAVICIDE trademarks and includes an "About Us" page claiming more than two decades of use of the Trademark and the sale of disinfectant wipes.

The Complainant also asserts that the Respondent has impersonated the Complainant by using its trademarks and has reproduced photographs owned by the Complainant without authorization. The Complainant further alleges that the contact address and telephone number displayed on the Respondent's website are not legitimate.

In addition, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of registering domain names corresponding to third-party trademarks, including the disputed domain name, in order to prevent trademark owners from reflecting their marks in corresponding domain names.

On this basis, the Complainant maintains that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, and that no plausible good-faith use of the CAVIWIPES Trademark by the Respondent is conceivable.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must prove each of the following three elements in order to succeed in its complaint:

- (i) 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 respect of disputed domain name; and
- (iii) disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The burden of proof of each element is borne by the Complainant. The Respondent's default does not by itself mean that the Complainant is deemed to have prevailed. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.3.

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 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 Trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of another term, here the article “the”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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.

The disputed domain name leads to a website that gives the impression of being the Complainant’s official website. The website uses the Complainant’s CAVIWIPES Trademark in multiple places and also in the top-left corner in the form of a logo, and displays product images of the Complainant’s products in a similar way to the Complainant. Therefore, the disputed domain name, which varies from the Trademark and the Complainant’s domain name <caviwipes.com> merely by the addition of the term “the”, carries a risk of implied affiliation and such composition cannot constitute fair use as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. The Respondent clearly misleads the consumers and diverts them from the real and official website of the Complainant, in order to create a commercial gain for itself. Such use cannot constitute bona fide commercial use, sufficient to legitimize any rights and interests the Respondent might have in the disputed domain name.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here impersonation/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.

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.

Bad faith requires the Respondent to be aware of the Complainant's Trademark. The fact that the website attached to the disputed domain name gives the impression of being the Complainant's official website, by using the Complainant's mark, product images, and branding features, the Panel finds that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's Trademark when it registered the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has sought to create a misleading impression of association with the Complainant. The disputed domain name is ideally suited to misleading the public, especially as the disputed domain name resolves to a website that intentionally gives the impression of being the Complainant's official website. As a result, the consumer may get the impression that the website is an official outlet of the Complainant, or a corporation associated with it, and is thus being misled. Such a use of a domain name, in a blatant targeting of the Complainant's trademark rights, obviously amounts to a use in bad faith.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here impersonation/passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

As the Complainant has noted, the Respondent appears to have been involved in several other UDRP cases: *Stove Kraft Limited v. Alex Harrison*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-1454](#) (N.B. In this case the contested domain name was registered on October 2, 2025, the same day the disputed domain name in the present proceedings was registered on.); *Onesto Labs Private Limited v. Alex Harrison*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-1369](#); *Boot Barn, Inc. v. Alex Harrison*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-4944](#); and *Thankyoufarmer Co., Ltd v. Alex Harrison*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2870](#). The Panel's limited independent search has revealed that the Respondent never filed a response and in all cases the transfer or cancellation of the contested domain name was ordered. The Respondent appears to consistently engage in domain name abuse in a more or less similar way. In all these cases, the contested domain name differed only slightly from the Complainant's trademark. The impression was consistently given that the websites where the contested domain names directed to were affiliated with the complainant and listed the complainant's products, often referring to the Amazon platform.

For the purposes of the third element of the Policy, such pattern of abusive conduct shall be further evidence of bad faith registration. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.2.

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 <thecaviwipes.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Richard C.K. van Oerle/

Richard C.K. van Oerle

Sole Panelist

Date: July 20, 2026