

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ChemTreat, Inc., v. Joe Marlom, chemtreatsolutions
Case No. D2026-3629

1. The Parties

The Complainant is ChemTreat, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Hahn Loeser & Parks LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Joe Marlom, chemtreatsolutions, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 13, 2026. On August 14, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 17, 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 17, 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 August 19, 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 August 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 11, 2026.

The Center appointed William F. Hamilton as the sole panelist in this matter on September 16, 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 1968, the Complainant provides industrial water and process treatment services, including chemical treatments and automated control systems, in the United States and internationally.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations worldwide for CHEMTREAT and CHEMTREAT SOLUTIONS. These include United States Reg. No. 1,136,528 for the word mark CHEMTREAT, registered June 3, 1980, for industrial water treatment chemicals, with a claim of use since at least September 27, 1978; United States Reg. No. 2,327,795 for the word mark CHEMTREAT SOLUTIONS (the “Mark”), registered March 14, 2000, for computer software designed to monitor, control, and log data from water treatment operations; and United States Reg. Nos. 4,760,171 and 4,779,987 for a stylized version of CHEMTREAT (the “Design Mark”), registered June 23, 2015 and July 28, 2015, respectively, for water treatment services and industrial water treatment chemicals (Annex 4 to the Complaint). The Complainant holds corresponding registrations for these marks in Brazil, Canada, Chile, the European Union, Mexico, Peru, and the United Kingdom (Annex 4 to the Complaint).

The Complainant has operated a website at “chemtreat.com” promoting its goods and services since at least May 8, 1998 (Annex 5 to the Complaint).

The disputed domain name <chemtreasuresolutions.com> was created on December 26, 2022, and is registered with the Registrar (Annex 1 to the Complaint).

The disputed domain name resolves to an active website operating under the name “ChemTreat Solutions LLC.” The website displays a logo that is similar to the Design Mark together with the word “solutions”, and describes the Respondent as offering “Product Development” services for the “Food Industry”, “Industrial Applications”, and “Resources & Energy”. The website states that consumers “can count on our innovative solutions to contribute to safer, cleaner and more sustainable future”, and lists the contact email address “[...]@chemtreasuresolutions.com” and a business address, corresponding to the address disclosed by the Registrar for the registrant of the disputed domain name (Annex 6 to the Complaint). The website’s “Contact Us” link opens a form soliciting the visitor’s name, email address, and message.¹

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the three elements required under the Policy for transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical to the Mark, which wholly incorporates CHEMTREAT SOLUTIONS, and that the Respondent’s website uses the Mark and CHEMTREAT to advertise goods and services similar to those covered by the Complainant’s registrations.

¹ The Panel visited the website at the disputed domain name on September 18, 2026, to verify this feature, consistent with a panel’s discretion to undertake limited independent research into the use of a disputed domain name. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 4.8.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent is neither licensed nor otherwise authorized to use the Mark, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services or engaging in a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Complainant also contends that the telephone number listed on the Respondent's website does not function, that the address listed does not correspond to any business offering the services described on the website, and that the website does not offer any actual products or services.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant contends that the Respondent had actual or constructive knowledge of the Complainant's rights in the Mark, given the Complainant's decades of use and registered trademark rights, and that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to create a false impression of affiliation with the Complainant. The Complainant contends that the Respondent's website displays the Design Mark combined with the word "solutions" and repeats CHEMTREAT and CHEMTREAT SOLUTIONS throughout the page. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent's use of the email address "[...]@chemtreasuresolutions.com" is intended to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has established rights in the Mark through its registration for CHEMTREAT SOLUTIONS, United States Reg. No. 2,327,795 (Annex 4 to the Complaint). See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name <chemtreasuresolutions.com> is identical to the Mark, differing only by the addition of the ".com" generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"). A domain name that wholly incorporates a complainant's trademark is normally considered identical or confusingly similar to that trademark for purposes of the first element. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. The gTLD is disregarded for this comparison because it is a standard registration requirement. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is identical to the Mark and that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy lists circumstances that, if proven, demonstrate a respondent's rights or legitimate interests in a domain name. Once a complainant establishes a prima facie case that a respondent lacks such rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to come forward with evidence to the contrary. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

The Complainant has established a prima facie case. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the Mark, and the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent did not reply to the Complaint and has not presented any evidence of rights or legitimate interests.

The record shows that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to operate a website that combines the Mark and uses a logo similar to the Design Mark to present itself as “Chemtreat Solutions LLC”, a purported provider of water and chemical treatment services, same services provided by the Complainant under the Mark, while using an email address that incorporates the Mark. The Panel finds that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name does not represent a bona fide offering and rather amounts to impersonation of the Complainant. Panels have held that using a domain name to impersonate a complainant can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy identifies bad faith where a respondent uses a domain name to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website by creating a likelihood of confusion with a complainant’s mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

The Mark and the Design Mark were registered decades before the disputed domain name was created in 2022, and the Complainant has used both continuously in the industrial water treatment industry, in which the Respondent’s website purports to operate. The Respondent’s adoption of a domain name identical to the Mark, a similar logo, combining the Design Mark with the word “solutions”, and the trade name “Chemtreat Solutions LLC” make clear that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant’s trademark rights and to target the Complainant. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The Respondent has used the disputed domain name to operate a website that impersonates the Complainant: it displays a logo similar to the Design Mark, describes services that overlap with the Complainant’s business, uses an email address that reproduces the Mark, and solicits visitor information through a “Contact Us” form. Panels have held that using a domain name for illegitimate activity, including impersonation of a trademark owner, is evidence of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith and that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <chemtreasuresolutions.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/William F. Hamilton/

William F. Hamilton

Sole Panelist

Date: September 22, 2026