

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ARKEMA FRANCE v. sly opez, dexter intl limited
Case No. D2026-3907

1. The Parties

The Complainant is ARKEMA FRANCE, France, represented by In Concreto, France.

The Respondent is sly opez, dexter intl limited, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <arkema.it.com>¹ is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 1, 2026. On September 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 3, 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 (UNKNOWN) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 4, 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 September 8, 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”).

¹ The Panel notes that <arkema.it.com> is a third-level domain name falling under the .it.com Dispute Resolution Policy which provides that the registrants agree to abide by the results of a UDRP proceeding if informal resolution in coordination with IT.com Domains is unsuccessful. The Complainant has provided evidence that it filed an abuse complaint with IT.com Domains, and the Panel has received no confirmation that any settlement had taken place under the it.com Dispute Resolution Procedure. The Panel will accordingly proceed to a decision under the UDRP.

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 29, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 30, 2026.

The Center appointed Adam Samuel as the sole panelist in this matter on October 2, 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 French company that makes and distributes material science products. The Complainant owns a United States of America trademark registration number 3082057 for ARKEMA registered on April 18, 2006. The Complainant markets its services through the domain name <arkema.com>, registered on May 21, 2001.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 30, 2026. It has never resolved to an active website. On the same date, someone used an email address linked to the disputed domain name to persuade clients of the Complainant to pay amounts due to the Complainant to another bank account.

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 prior highly distinctive trademark "ARKEMA" of the Complainant in its entirety, without combining it with any other distinctive element. The ".it.com" extension is generally understood either as a reference to the information technology (IT) sector, with which innovative companies such as the Complainant may be associated, or to Italy, where the Complainant conducts significant business activities. Such a domain name is likely to be wrongly linked to Complainant or one of its subsidiaries, notably in Italy.

Before a takedown request initiated by the Complainant on February 9, 2026, the disputed domain name was used for phishing purposes. The Respondent has no rights to the domain name or legitimate interests in respect to it. The Complainant has not licensed or authorized the Respondent to use its trademarks or domain names, nor has it allowed the Respondent to reserve or use a domain name incorporating the Complainant's rights.

The Respondent has been unlawfully using the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant by sending phishing emails and trying to extract money from its customers. This deceptive conduct aims to exploit the Complainant's reputation and illegitimately trade on its fame for potentially gaining money, while misleading the public or the recipient of its emails into believing that it is the Complainant and even the Complainant's employee.

The reservation of a domain name identical or highly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights while the Respondent has no right to the domain name or legitimate interests in this respect and without authorization, demonstrates in itself that the Respondent is acting in bad faith.

ARKEMA is not a descriptive term, a commonly used expression, or a word that would be instantly understood in the field of industry. The denomination ARKEMA has therefore a highly distinctive character. It is thus very unlikely that the Respondent chose the disputed domain name <arkema.it.com> without any

knowledge of the company name, domain names or trademarks of the company. Thanks to the well-established status of the Complainant, the Respondent knew that the disputed domain name would be confusingly similar to the Complainant's prior rights and thus registered the disputed domain name <arkema.it.com> with the Complainant's prior rights in mind.

In addition, the disputed domain name has been created and used for the specific purpose of creating messaging servers, which were active before the takedown request initiated by the Complainant on February 9, 2026. Consecutively to the creation of such messaging servers, and before the Complainant takedown request, email addresses based on this domain name have been created. The fraudulent email addresses were identical to the Complainant's employee's email addresses, with the same first name and last name. The fraudulent invoice reproduced the Complainant's invoices in every respect, except for the banking details.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied:

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

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's trademark and the applicable Top-Level Domain ("TLD"), ".it.com". The TLD is irrelevant here as it is a standard registration requirement. See section 1.11.1 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)").

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Based on the available record, the Respondent is not called or commonly known by "arkema" or anything similar. There is no evidence that the Complainant has ever authorised the Respondent to use its trademarks or that the Respondent has made a bona fide offering or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Panel further notes that, on the day on which the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, the disputed domain name was used for an email that sought to impersonate the Complainant and divert payments due to the Complainant to someone else's bank account. For these reasons, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has met this element. See sections 2.1 and 2.13.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

On the date on which the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, it appears to have emailed a customer of the Complainant an invoice, impersonating a member of the Complainant's staff, indicating that the customer should make payments to a bank account not belonging to the Complainant and presumably controlled by the Respondent or someone connected to it.

Section 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) says of this type of phishing activity:

“... Given that the use of a domain name for per se illegitimate activity such as ... phishing can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent, such behavior is manifestly considered evidence of bad faith.”

Section 3.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) adds:

“Panels have held that the use of a domain name for purposes other than to host a website may constitute bad faith. Such active (‘behind the scenes’) uses ... can include a range of bad faith activity or scams such as sending email, phishing.... Many such cases involve the respondent’s use of the domain name to send deceptive emails, e.g., to obtain sensitive or confidential personal information ... or to solicit payment of fraudulent invoices by the complainant’s actual or prospective customers.”

For all these reasons, the Panel concludes that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith.

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 <arkema.it.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Adam Samuel/

Adam Samuel

Sole Panelist

Date: October 4, 2026