

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Solvay S.A. v. Jonas Work

Case No. D2026-3749

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Solvay S.A., Belgium, represented by Novagraaf Belgium NV/SA, Belgium.

The Respondent is Jonas Work, Netherlands (Kingdom of the).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <solvay-europe.com> is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 21, 2026. On August 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 25, 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 (Name redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 27, 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 27, 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 September 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 24, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 25, 2026.

The Center appointed Luca Barbero as the sole panelist in this matter on October 5, 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 global leader in chemicals and materials such as high performance polymers and composite technologies and provides solutions and applications in many sectors such as agriculture, personal care, healthcare, consumer food, automotive, aerospace or electronics.

Founded in 1863, the Complainant is headquartered in Brussels, Belgium and owns offices and production sites in more than 60 countries, employing about 22,000 people. In 2022, the Complainant net sales reached 13.4 billion euro.

The Complainant is the owner, amongst others, of the following trademark registrations:

- European Union Trade Mark registration No. 000067801 for SOLVAY (word mark), filed on April 1, 1996, and registered on May 30, 2000, in classes 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 17, 19, 20 and 31;
- European Union Trade Mark registration No. 011664091 for SOLVAY (word mark), filed on March 18, 2013, and registered on August 13, 2013, in classes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 17, 22, 23, 24, 25, 30, 31, 35, 36, 37, 40 and 42;
- International trademark registration No. 1171614 for SOLVAY (word mark), registered on February 28, 2013, in classes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 17, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 30, 31, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40 and 42;
- United States trademark registration No. 2770637 for SOLVAY (word mark), filed on September 26, 2000, and registered on October 7, 2003, in international classes 1, 5, 17 and 31.

The Complainant is also the owner of numerous domain names encompassing SOLVAY, including <solway.com> registered on March 21, 1995, <solway.us>, registered on May 3, 2002, and <solway.be>, registered on August 21, 1998, which all resolve to the website “www.solway.com”, used by the Complainant to promote its products and services under the trademark SOLVAY.

The disputed domain name <solway-europe.com> was registered on August 8, 2026, and does not resolve to an active website. Based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant, which has not been contested by the Respondent, an email address based on the disputed domain name was indicated as contact information on a false proforma invoice bearing the Complainant's SOLVAY mark, which was sent to one of the Complainant's customers.

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 is confusingly similar to the trademark SOLVAY in which the Complainant has rights as it reproduces the trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the geographical term “Europe” and the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com”.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name since: i) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and owns no trademarks corresponding to the disputed domain name; ii) the Respondent has in no way been licensed or authorized by the Complainant to use its SOLVAY mark in any way; iii) the disputed domain name currently does not resolve to an active website and, therefore, is not used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; and iv) the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to conduct fraudulent activities via the email address @solway-europe.com, reaching out to the Complainant's clients and

requesting the payment of a false proforma invoice which included the Complainant's name and logo and reference to the email address "[...]"@solvay-europe.com" as well as to a bank account different from that of the Complainant.

With reference to the circumstances evidencing bad faith instead, the Complainant indicates that, considering the degree of reputation of the Complainant's trademarks and activities, the Respondent could not ignore the existence of the Complainant's prior rights and it is not conceivable that the Respondent did not have in mind the Complainant's trademark when it registered the disputed domain name.

The Complainant also states that the absence of use of the disputed domain name in connection with an active website does not prevent the finding of bad faith use under the doctrine of passive holding given the high degree of distinctiveness and reputation of SOLVAY and the overall circumstances of the case.

The Complainant further states that the Respondent's bad faith is demonstrated by its use of an email address based on the disputed domain name to request the payment of false invoices, which were issued without the Complainant's authorization and included the Complainant's name and logo in an attempt to impersonate the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules: "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable." Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) that the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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. Indeed, the Complainant has provided evidence of valid trademark registrations for the word mark SOLVAY.

The entirety of the mark 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, "Europe", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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.

As to the gTLD “.com”, it is a standard registration requirement and can be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Therefore, 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.

According to the evidence on record, there is no relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent, and the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to register or use its trademark or the disputed domain name. Moreover, there is no element from which the Panel could infer the Respondent’s rights over the disputed domain name, or that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, there is no evidence showing that the Respondent made use of, or preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial use without intention to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the SOLVAY mark.

Indeed, even though the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website, based on the evidence provided by the Complainant – which has not been challenged by the Respondent -, the disputed domain name was used to create an email address that was listed as contact information on a false proforma invoice bearing the Complainant’s mark, which was sent to one of the Complainant’s customers in connection with the purchase of a SOLVAY product.

Such use of the disputed domain name suggests that the Respondent was actually aware of the Complainant and its trademark and intended to impersonate the Complainant through the registration and use of the disputed domain name, with the aim of attempting to obtain payments from users who believed they were dealing with the Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, such as phishing/identity theft, passing off, or other types of fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Moreover, the Panel also finds that the disputed domain name, incorporating the Complainant’s distinctive and well-known trademark SOLVAY in combination with the geographic term “Europe”, is inherently misleading as it suggests an affiliation with the Complainant. Even where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term, UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute

fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Therefore, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has also 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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but 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.

In the present case, in light of the Complainant's prior registration of the SOLVAY mark in several countries, the widespread use of the trademark by the Complainant, including online via the Complainant's website "www.solvay.com", and the reputation of the mark in Europe, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant and its SOLVAY mark at the time of registration. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

In view of the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark and the composition of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the Respondent was indeed aware of, and intended to target, the Complainant and its trademark.

The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website. However, as highlighted above, the Complainant has provided evidence of use of the disputed domain name in an email address cited in a false proforma invoice displaying the Complainant's mark and requesting payment from a customer of the Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for purposes other than to host a website, such as phishing/identity theft, passing off, may constitute bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. In the present case, the Panel finds that, under the circumstances, the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute an act of bad faith.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy as well.

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 <solvay-europe.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Luca Barbero/

Luca Barbero

Sole Panelist

Date: October 19, 2026