ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Molex, LLC v. David Chung, Scondar Electronic Co.,Ltd.
Case No. D2026-3089

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Molex, LLC, United States of America ("US"), represented by East IP Limited, Hong Kong, China.

The Respondent is David Chung, Scondar Electronic Co.,Ltd., China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ismolex.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 14, 2026. On July 14, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 14, 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 the Complainant on July 14, 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 22, 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 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Tommaso La Scala as the sole panelist in this matter on August 17, 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

Founded in 1938, the Complainant is a US electronic manufacturing company providing electronic interconnect solutions, including pin headers and other connectors, marketed under the MOLEX trademark.

The Complainant owns several MOLEX trademarks, including among others:

(i) Chinese trademark registration No. 344511, registered on April 10, 1989;
(ii) Malaysian trademark registration No. 94001428, registered on June 11, 2008; and
(iii) US trademark registration No. 6302812, registered on March 23, 2021.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 11, 2014, and resolves to a website operating under the sign "Smolex", purportedly offering pin header and female header connectors in direct competition with the Complainant's products, and stating: "Smolex as subsidiary of SCONDAR Electronic Co.,Ltd. only focus on Pin Header & Female header connectors for over 16 years". The website of SCONDAR Electronic Co.,Ltd. is located at "www.scondar.com", which displays cross-references to the Complainant's MOLEX connectors, and SCONDAR Electronic Co.,Ltd. has purportedly offered products branded MOLEX through third-party online marketplaces.

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 reproduces the MOLEX trademark in its entirety and as its dominant part, and that the addition of the non-distinctive term "is" and of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, as it has never been licensed or otherwise authorized by the Complainant to use the MOLEX trademark or to register any domain name incorporating it, and as the disputed domain name resolves to a website offering products in direct competition with the Complainant's goods, which cannot amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services nor to a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Lastly, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, since the Respondent (a manufacturer of connectors whose own website cross-references the Complainant's products and which has offered MOLEX-branded goods) obviously had actual knowledge of the Complainant's trademark when it registered the disputed domain name, and has used it to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the MOLEX trademark.

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 the MOLEX trademark for the purposes of the Policy, particularly by virtue of the registrations listed in section 4 above. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name reproduces the MOLEX trademark in its entirety, preceded by the two-letter element "is". The MOLEX trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, and the addition of the element "is" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8. The gTLD ".com" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element. 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 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 Complainant affirms that it has never licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use its MOLEX trademark or to register any domain name incorporating it, and there is no relationship between the Parties. There is furthermore no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent's name, as disclosed by the Registrar, is David Chung, Scondar Electronic Co.,Ltd. Although the website at the disputed domain name displays the sign "Smolex" and claims that "Smolex" is a "subsidiary" of SCONDAR Electronic Co.,Ltd., which appears to be the Respondent's company, there is no supporting evidence demonstrating that the Respondent is commonly known by "Smolex" or by the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.3. In addition, considering the Panel's findings under the third element, it is more likely than not that the sign "Smolex" was adopted to trade on the reputation of the Complainant's trademark. Furthermore, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name is composed of "ismolex" rather than "smolex", and Internet users may easily read the disputed domain name as "is" plus "molex" and mistakenly believe that it belongs to the Complainant.

Moreover, the evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that the disputed domain name resolves to a website offering pin header and female header connectors in direct competition with the Complainant's goods, under a domain name confusingly similar to the MOLEX trademark. Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for commercial activity competing with the complainant, in circumstances indicating an intent to capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant's trademark, cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

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. Such circumstances are however not exhaustive, and 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.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 11, 2014, well after the registration of the Complainant's MOLEX trademarks in China (dating back to 1989) and in Malaysia (dating back to 2008).

According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Respondent's company Scondar Electronic Co., Ltd. is a Chinese manufacturer of connectors which, on its own website at "www.scondar.com", expressly cross-references the Complainant's MOLEX connectors, and the Respondent has purportedly offered MOLEX-branded products through third-party online marketplaces. In these circumstances, and in the absence of any explanation from the Respondent, the Panel finds that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, and that the composition of the disputed domain name itself – which has no dictionary meaning and may be easily seen by Internet users as connected to the Complainant – confirms that it was registered with the Complainant's trademark in mind.

As to use in bad faith, the evidence shows that the disputed domain name resolves to a website purportedly offering connectors in direct competition with the Complainant's goods. By using a domain name confusingly similar to the MOLEX trademark to offer competing products, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website and of the products offered thereon, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Such conduct is also apt to disrupt the business of the Complainant. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

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 <ismolex.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Tommaso La Scala/
Tommaso La Scala
Sole Panelist
Date: August 31, 2026