

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Syensqo S.A. v. Abdul Rosid
Case No. D2026-2906

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Syensqo S.A., Belgium, represented by Fencer BV, Belgium.

The Respondent is Abdul Rosid, Indonesia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ptsyensqomanyar.com> is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 3, 2026. On July 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 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 (Whois Privacy Protection Foundation) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 6, 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 July 7, 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 July 14, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 3, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Shwetasree Majumder as the sole panelist in this matter on August 18, 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 Belgian company having its registered offices in Brussels, Belgium. It is a technology company specializing in advanced materials and chemical solutions and is listed on Euronext Brussels. The Complainant was formerly part of Solvay S.A. and, following its demerger, adopted the name Syensqo in December 2023.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for the mark SYENSQO in a number of jurisdictions, in classes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 17, 24, 30, 37, 40, and 42. The details of certain of these registrations are set out below:

- International Registration No. 1773284 for SYENSQO, registered on June 26, 2023;
- Benelux Trademark Registration No. 1498876 for the SYENSQO logo, registered on February 21, 2024; and
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 018888334 for SYENSQO, registered on October 31, 2023.

A group entity of the Complainant operates in Indonesia under the name PT Syensqo Manyar, having changed its name from PT Solvay Manyar in August 2025, and having a registered address in Indonesia.

The Complainant's official website is "www.syensqo.com". The Complainant's domain name <syensqo.com> was registered on June 2, 2023.

The disputed domain name <ptsyensqomanyar.com> was registered on March 28, 2026. It resolved to a webpage displaying pay-per-click ("PPC") hyperlinks to web hosting, domain name registration, and online marketing services. Following a complaint made by the Complainant to the Registrar, the website was taken down. The registrant of the disputed domain name was concealed behind the Privacy Service "Whois Privacy Protection Foundation," and the underlying registrant details were disclosed by the Registrar only during the present proceedings. The registrant address disclosed corresponds closely to the address of the Complainant's group entity PT Syensqo Manyar.

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.

The Complainant contends that it adopted the name Syensqo in December 2023 following its demerger from Solvay S.A., that it employs more than 13,000 people across 30 countries, and that it owns numerous trademark registrations and applications for the SYENSQO mark and logo. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name contains the SYENSQO trademark in its entirety and is identical to the company name and trade name under which the Complainant's group operates in Indonesia, and that the additional term "manyar" is descriptive of a geographic location in Indonesia which the Complainant itself uses to designate its manufacturing site there.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, that it has not authorized the Respondent to use its trademarks or its company and trade names, and that the domain name of this composition falsely suggests affiliation with the Complainant. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, that the disputed domain name resolved to a website containing hyperlinks to third-party services, and that notwithstanding the take-down of that website the disputed domain name may still be used for email-related functionality, creating a risk of confusion as to the source of communications.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the 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 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.

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

Although the addition of other terms here, "pt" and "manyar", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark 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 Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the Complainant's SYENSQO trademark. There is no evidence in the record that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or has acquired any trademark rights in the term "syensqo". The Respondent has used the disputed domain name to resolve to a webpage displaying PPC hyperlinks, which does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor to a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.9. The Panel notes that the Complainant's mark SYENSQO is a coined and invented term with no dictionary meaning, and hence there is no plausible reason for the Respondent to register or use the disputed domain name wholly incorporating the mark SYENSQO. The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name reproduces in full the corporate name of the Complainant's group entity in Indonesia and that the Respondent gave that entity's address as its registrant address. The Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name effectively impersonates, or at the very least suggests sponsorship or endorsement by, the Complainant's group entity, and as such cannot constitute fair use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant's SYENSQO trademark registrations predate the registration of the disputed domain name by more than two years, and that "syensqo" is a coined and invented term with no dictionary meaning. The disputed domain name combines that mark with the terms "pt" and "manyar", the combination corresponding exactly to the corporate name of the Complainant's group entity in Indonesia, PT Syensqo Manyar, which adopted that name in August 2025, some seven months before the registration of the disputed domain name. The Panel further notes that the registrant address disclosed by the Registrar is the address of that entity's own premises in Indonesia. In these circumstances the Panel finds that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its group entity when registering the disputed domain name and selected the disputed domain name to impersonate that entity.

The disputed domain name resolved to a webpage displaying PPC hyperlinks to third-party web hosting, domain name registration, and online marketing services. The Panel finds that by using the disputed domain name in this manner the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of that website, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The subsequent take-down of that website following the Complainant's approach to the Registrar does not cure the Respondent's bad faith.

The circumstances listed in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy are not exhaustive, and other circumstances may equally 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 further notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name behind a privacy service, which in the circumstances of this case reinforces the Panel's inference of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.6. The Respondent has also failed to submit any response to the Complaint, and has thus offered no explanation for its selection of a domain name reproducing the corporate name and using the registered address of the Complainant's group entity in Indonesia.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has 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 <ptsyensqomanyar.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Shwetasree Majumder/

Shwetasree Majumder

Sole Panelist

Date: September 1, 2026