

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Survitec Group Limited v. Confiscated for Abuse or Non-Payment,
NETWORKSOLUTIONS.COM Holding Account
Case No. D2026-2960

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Survitec Group Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Safenames Ltd, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Confiscated for Abuse or Non-Payment, NETWORKSOLUTIONS.COM Holding Account, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <survitecsgroup.com> (the "Domain Name") is registered with Network Solutions, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 6, 2026. On July 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On July 7, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 July 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 30, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on August 11, 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 to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant was founded over 100 years ago. It provides survival technology solutions in the maritime and energy markets, including maritime evacuation systems, immersion suits, lifeboats, and personal protection and first-aid solutions. The Complainant also offers training courses. The Complainant employs over 2,000 employees worldwide, operating in over 2,000 ports which span across 96 countries, 8 manufacturing facilities and more than 400 service centers.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations of the SURVITEC brand included, such as United States trademark registration No. 4033988 (registered on October 4, 2011) and European Union trademark registration no. 009495417 (registered on May 3, 2011). The Complainant's website at "www.survitecgroup.com" had over 52,000 visitors in May 2026. The Complainant had an annual revenue of over GBP 60 million in 2024. It has earned several awards, and its social media presence has amassed approximately 6,000 followers.

The Domain Name was registered on February 7, 2026. The Complainant documents that the Domain Name has been used to resolve pay-per-click webpage with links and that, since the filing of the Complaint, it has not resolved to an active webpage.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant provides evidence of trademark registrations and argues that its trademark is well-known. The Domain Name includes the entirety of the Complainant's trademark with the additions of "s" and the term "group". The Complainant argues that the addition of the term "group" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, neither does the addition of the letter "s" to pluralize the SURVITEC mark. It does nothing to imbue any distinctiveness into the Domain Name.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Respondent is not authorized, licensed, or permitted to register or use a domain name incorporating the Complainant's trademark. The Respondent does not have any trademark rights to the term "Survitec" or any other term used in the Domain Name. There is no evidence that the Respondent retains unregistered trademark rights. The Complainant submits that the Respondent is not using, nor is preparing to use, the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The current non-use of the Domain Name cannot under the circumstances of this case be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant argues inter alia that its trademark registrations predate the registration date of the Domain Name with close to 15 years, and the Complainant and its trademark is well-known in its field of business. As such, there is no reason for the Respondent to register the Domain Name other than to target the Complainant's brand. Moreover, the Domain Name differs from the Complainant's own domain name by one letter. This suggests that the Domain Name was registered with the Complainant in mind. The Domain Name has been "confiscated for Abuse or Non-Payment" by the registrar. The Complainant submits this is further evidence of bad faith. As is the fact that the Domain Name has resolved to a webpage featuring sponsored links to third parties' commercial websites, on a pay-per-click basis. The bad faith is not cured by the fact that the Domain Name no longer resolves to an active webpage.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

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 Domain Name. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has established that it has rights in the trademark SURVITEC. The Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's trademark with the addition of "sgruoup". The addition does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the trademark. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. For the purpose of assessing confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel may ignore the generic Top-Level Domain. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which a respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Based on the evidence, the Respondent is not affiliated or related to the Complainant in any way. There is no evidence that the Respondent has registered the Domain Name as a trademark or acquired trademark rights. There is no evidence of the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, the use of the Domain Name, as described above, is evidence of bad faith. The Panel finds also that the composition of the Domain Name, which is almost identical to the Complainant's domain name save for a minor misspelling, signals the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the Domain Name and the Complainant.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

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.

Based on the composition of the Domain Name, the Panel finds that the Respondent likely knew of the Complainant when it registered the Domain Name. The Respondent has not provided any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use of the Domain Name. On the contrary, the Respondent has used the Domain Name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website with pay-per-click links, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source,

sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. Such conduct demonstrates bad faith registration and use within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel considers that the subsequent non-use of the Domain Name does not prevent a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this case. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3

Based on the available record, 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 the Domain Name <survitecsgroup.com> transferred to the Complainant.

/Mathias Lilleengen/

Mathias Lilleengen

Sole Panelist

Date: August 19, 2026