ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Meridian Plumbing Co., Inc. v. Joshua Huber
Case No. D2026-2527

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Meridian Plumbing Co., Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Hawley Troxell Ennis & Hawley LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Joshua Huber, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 10, 2026. On June 11, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 11, 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 (WHOIS.CLOUDFLARE.COM) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 12, 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 amendment to the Complaint on June 15, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 13, 2026. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on July 7, 2026 and July 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Evan D. Brown as the sole panelist in this matter on July 20, 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 in the plumbing business. It owns the mark MERIDIAN PLUMBING and enjoys the benefits of registration of that mark in the United States (Reg. No. 5421636, registered on March 13, 2018). The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on May 24, 2026. It used the disputed domain name to set up a website which resolves to a website purportedly offering plumbing services which the Complainant claims competed with those of the Complainant. After the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter on May 29, 2026, the disputed domain name resolved to an inactive site.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not formally respond to the Complainant's contentions. On July 7, 2026, the Respondent sent an email to the Center in which the Respondent expressly consented to the remedy sought by the Complainant, agreed to the transfer, and assured he would cooperate with any steps the Registrar requires to complete the transfer. Importantly, for purposes of this case, the Respondent did not deny liability, disclaim responsibility, or otherwise seek to reserve any rights in the disputed domain name.

6. Discussion and Findings

In response to the Respondent's unequivocal and unqualified consent to transfer the disputed domain name, the Complainant merely asserted that it "does not wish to proceed with settlement."

WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.10 provides as follows:

Where parties to a UDRP proceeding have not been able to settle their dispute prior to the issuance of a panel decision using the "standard settlement process" described above [in the WIPO Overview 3.1], but where the respondent has nevertheless given its consent on the record to the transfer (or cancellation) remedy sought by the complainant, many panels will order the requested remedy solely on the basis of such consent. In such cases, the panel gives effect to an understood party agreement as to the disposition of their case (whether by virtue of deemed admission, or on a no-fault basis).

In some cases, despite such respondent consent, a panel may in its discretion still find it appropriate to proceed to a substantive decision on the merits. Scenarios in which a panel may find it appropriate to do so include (i) where the panel finds a broader interest in recording a substantive decision on the merits – notably recalling UDRP paragraph 4(b)(ii) discussing a pattern of bad faith conduct, (ii) where while consenting to the requested remedy the respondent has expressly disclaimed any bad faith, (iii) where the complainant has not agreed to accept such consent and has expressed a preference for a recorded decision on the merits, (iv) where there is ambiguity as to the scope of the respondent's consent, or (v) where the panel wishes to be certain that the complainant has shown that it possesses relevant trademark rights.

This case is distinguishable from cases such as *GitHub, Inc. v. Chris Koepke*, WIPO Case No. D2023-2995 in which a panel discussed the merits of the case even though the respondent had consented to the transfer of the disputed domain name. The panel therein observed that a determination on the merits was appropriate because the respondent had disclaimed bad faith, and there was, in the panel's view, a public interest in exposing that situation's alleged identity theft and malware distribution.

In this case, the absence of any egregious bad faith conduct or pattern behavior, combined with the Respondent's unequivocal consent to the transfer remedy sought, means that there is not as pressing of a public interest warranting a full substantive decision. Here, where the Respondent has given unequivocal consent to the transfer, and in the absence of exceptional circumstances, rendering a decision based on such consent is aligned with the UDRP's objective of efficient dispute resolution.

Guided by these principles, the Panel finds that notwithstanding the Complainant's preference not to settle, there is party agreement as to how the case should be disposed of, namely, that the disputed domain name should be transferred to the Complainant. None of the countervailing scenarios contemplated in WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.10 is present here to necessitate the Panel's substantive attention to the three Policy elements.

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 <meridianplumb.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Evan D. Brown/
Evan D. Brown
Sole Panelist
Date: July 29, 2026