

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Howmet Aerospace Inc. v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2026-3343

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Howmet Aerospace Inc., United States of America ("US"), represented by Greenberg Traurig, LLP, US.

The Respondent is Name Redacted¹.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <howmet-aerospace.com> is registered with Squarespace Domains LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 28, 2026. On July 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same day, 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 30, 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 August 3, 2026.

¹ The Respondent appears to have used the name of a former employee of the Complainant and an organization name close to the name of one of the Complainant's affiliates when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent's name from this decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST 12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

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 August 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 25, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 31, 2026.

The Center appointed Dennis A. Foster as the sole panelist in this matter on September 3, 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 well-established US company that conducts business on a worldwide basis within the realm of the aerospace, defense and transportation industries. Presently, the Complainant employs more than 25,000 people in 23 countries. Its 2025 revenues amounted to approximately USD 8.3 Billion.
- The Complainant has used the HOWMET mark for decades and, as of 2020, has used the HOWMET AEROSPACE trademark extensively in connection with its worldwide business operations.
- Since 2020, the Complainant has used the domain name <howmet.com> to host its principal website. Meanwhile, the website attached to the Complainant’s domain name <howmetaerospace.com> redirects to that same principal website. The Complainant is active on a number of social media platforms such as LinkedIn, Facebook and Instagram.
- Since 2020, the Complainant has operated under both the HOWMET and HOWMET AEROSPACE marks, both of which have been registered with many authorities around the world. For instance, the latter trademark has been registered by the Complainant in the US (Registration No. 6290194, registration date March 9, 2021, international class 20 for ceramic cores and wax and plastic patterns for metal casting. Also, Registration No. 6109136, registration date July 21, 2020, international class 42 for technical consultation, design and engineering services).
- The disputed domain name, <howmet-aerospace.com>, was registered on October 20, 2025. The disputed domain name redirects Internet users to the Complainant’s primary website at <howmet.com>.
- On July 13, 2026, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist email to the Respondent via the form on the Registrar’s website advising of the Complainant’s prior rights in the disputed domain name and demanding a transfer. The Respondent replied by email as follows: “I did register the domain name with the intention of potentially reselling it. [...] The current registration term expires on October 20, 2026. Unfortunately, I no longer have access to the registrar account and therefore, despite my sincere willingness to cooperate, I am not able to transfer or otherwise manage the domain.”

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends it has fulfilled the Policy requirements for a transfer of the disputed domain name per the below.

- The disputed domain name, <howmet-aerospace.com>, is nearly identical to the Complainant's HOWMET AEROSPACE mark. The inconsequential additions of a hyphen and the ".com" generic Top-Level-Domain ("gTLD") do not avoid confusing similarity with that mark.
- The Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant never authorized or consented to the Respondent's registration of a domain name containing the Complainant's trademarks.
- The Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services in connection with the disputed domain name, but instead registered it to sell it to the Complainant. Moreover, that intention with respect to the disputed domain name, together with the latter use of the disputed domain name for a website that redirects to the Complainant's website, fails to constitute a noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Finally, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known as the disputed domain name.
- The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Clearly, the Respondent was well-aware of the Complainant's HOWMET AEROSPACE mark and also of the Complainant's primary website that openly displays that mark.
- The Respondent's admission that he intended to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant is evidence of bad faith. Furthermore, the use of the website attached to the disputed domain name for redirection to the Complainant's business website constitutes bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name.
- The Respondent's use of the name of a former employee of the Complainant and an organization name close to the name of one of the Complainant's affiliates, as registrant of the disputed domain name is consistent with bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Pursuant to Policy paragraphs 4(a)(i), (ii), and (iii), the Panel may render a decision for the Complainant and grant a transfer of the disputed domain name, if the Complainant shows that:

The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has provided the Panel with pertinent evidence that it has registered its HOWMET AEROSPACE trademark in the US, and therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has sufficient rights in that mark to meet the requirements of Policy paragraph 4(a)(i). WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 1.2.1.

In viewing the disputed domain name, <howmet-aerospace.com>, the Panel notices that it is nearly identical to the Complainant’s HOWMET AEROSPACE trademark. The only minor difference is the inclusion of a hyphen instead of a blank space between the two principal terms therein. Many prior Policy panels have found that such a small difference entails a finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s mark. The Panel concludes, then, that the Complainant has established that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.8. The gTLD “.com” is not to be considered in an analysis for identity or confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

As a result, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the first element of the Policy per paragraph 4(a)(i).

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Since the Panel has found that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s registered trademark and there is no showing in the record that the Respondent has been granted any authorization to use that mark, the Complainant has presented a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Therefore, the burden falls upon the Respondent to provide evidence to rebut the Complainant’s prima facie case. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

As the Respondent has failed to file a Response, the Panel will rely on the reasonable contentions and evidence found within the Complaint to decide whether there exists a convincing rebuttal to the Complainant’s prima facie case. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1; see also *OSRAM GmbH. v. Mohammed Rafi/Domain Admin, Privacy Protection Service INC d/b/a PrivacyProtect.org*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-1149](#) (“The Respondent has not submitted a response to the Complaint, in the absence of which the Panel may accept all reasonable inferences and allegations in the Complaint as true.”).

The Complainant has provided clear evidence that the website at the disputed domain name redirects Internet users to the Complainant’s primary website. The Panel concludes that said use of the disputed domain name fails to constitute a “bona fide offering of goods or services” pursuant to Policy paragraph 4(c)(i). See *FXCM Global Services LLC v. WhoisGuard Protected, Whoisguard Inc. / Jenny Sohia*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-1111](#) (“Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services [...] Rather, the evidence demonstrates that Respondent has used the disputed domain name to divert Internet users to Complainant’s own website...”). Moreover, there is nothing in the record to suggest that the Respondent has ever been commonly known as the disputed domain name, as there is no similarity between that name and the Respondent’s name. The Panel further notes that the Respondent used the name of one of the Complainant’s former employees combined with an organization resembling one of the Complainant’s affiliated companies. Therefore, Policy paragraph 4(c)(ii) is inapplicable to this case as well. Finally, the Respondent’s redirecting traffic to the Complainant’s website is not “a legitimate non-commercial or fair use” of the disputed domain name under paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant’s prima facie case has not been rebutted by the Respondent and thus must prevail.

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the second element of the Policy at paragraph 4(a)(ii).

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Policy paragraph 4(b) sets forth four non-exhaustive circumstances under which a UDRP panel might find that a disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, including the following which fits the present case:

4(b)(iv): "...by using the domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the respondent's website or location or of a product or service on the respondent's website or location."

Also, as the Complainant contends, per Policy paragraph 4(b)(i), the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in an attempt to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant or to others.

Still further, per Policy paragraph 4(b)(ii), the Complainant has presented evidence that the Respondent has been engaged previously in a pattern of its bad faith conduct in this case, and in at least one other previous case used the Complainant's company names and trademarks.

The Panel is sure the Respondent was at all times well-aware of who the Complainant was and the nature of its business because the Respondent's pattern of conduct demonstrates a detailed knowledge of the Complainant. In the present case, the Respondent was so conversant with the Complainant and its business that the Respondent used the name of one of the Complainant's former employees and one of the Complainant's affiliated companies in order to register the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy per paragraph 4(a)(iii).

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, <howmet-aerospace.com>, be transferred to the Complainant.

/Dennis A. Foster/

Dennis A. Foster

Sole Panelist

Date: September 18, 2026