

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ichor Systems, Inc., v. 伊扣（东莞）科技有限公司 (yi kou dong guan ke ji you xian gong si)
Case No. D2026-4048

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Ichor Systems, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by The Belles Group, P.C., United States.

The Respondent is 伊扣（东莞）科技有限公司 (yi kou dong guan ke ji you xian gong si), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ichorsct.com> is registered with Alibaba Cloud Computing Ltd. d/b/a HiChina (www.net.cn) (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 9, 2026. On the following day, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 11, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name that differed from the named Respondent (REGISTRANT NAME REDACTED) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 12, 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 in English on September 22, 2026.

On September 12, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On September 22, 2026, the Complainant requested that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the language of the proceeding.

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 in Chinese and in English, and the proceedings commenced on September 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 14, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Matthew Kennedy as the sole panelist in this matter on October 20, 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 designs, engineers, manufactures, refurbishes, and retrofits gas and liquid delivery systems, chemical delivery systems, gas systems, valve manifold boxes, gas isolation boxes, gas sticks, modular gas systems, vapor delivery systems, and related equipment used in semiconductor, LED, industrial, and process-control applications. The Complainant holds United States trademark registration number 6,652,162 for ICHOR and a triangular device, registered on February 22, 2022, specifying services in classes 40 and 42, with claims of first use in commerce on June 19, 2018. The trademark registration is current. The Complainant also uses the domain name <ichorsystems.com> in connection with its website in English where it prominently displays its mark and promotes its engineering and manufacturing capabilities, integrated gas and chemical delivery systems, products, company information, and customer-contact resources.

The Respondent is a Chinese company.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 27, 2025. It resolves to a website in English and many other languages (Chinese not among them) that prominently displays an “ICHOR SCIENCE WITH NEXPART” logo and presents ICHOR-SCT as a producer and importer/exporter of pressure regulators, focusing on fluid control systems for the semiconductor industry. The page title reads “China Vacuum Components, Flexible Hoses, Ultra Clean Valves, Process Valves Manufacturer and Supplier”. The site offers “.e.g.lok products by Ichor branded”, and describes the trajectory of Shanghai .e.g.lok Fluid Technologies from EG-LOK to today’s ICHOR brand. The footer reserves the copyright of “ICHOR (Dongguan) Science Co., Ltd”. The website invites Internet users to send inquiries and offers a chat interface.

On September 1, 2026, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the contact email address on the Respondent’s website, but it was undeliverable at that address.

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 its ICHOR mark.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to register or use the disputed domain name or its ICHOR mark. The website associated with the disputed domain name falsely suggests sponsorship, affiliation, or authorization and is calculated to divert customers seeking the Complainant.

The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent selected a domain name beginning with the exact and distinctive term ICHOR; adopted the ICHOR name and logo on the associated website; represented that it operates as “ICHOR (Dongguan) Science Co., Ltd.”; and offered products in the Complainant’s highly specialized semiconductor gas- and fluid-control field. The totality of these circumstances excludes coincidence and demonstrates deliberate targeting of the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Procedural Issue: Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint and amended Complaint were filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that the website associated with the disputed domain name is presented in English, which demonstrates that the Respondent is capable of understanding and conducting business in English; the disputed domain name is also composed entirely of Latin characters; and requiring the Complainant to translate the Complaint and supporting materials into Chinese would impose substantial additional expense and delay.

Despite the Center having sent an email regarding the language of the proceeding and the notification of the Complaint in Chinese and English, the Respondent did not make any submission with respect to the language of the proceeding or indicate any interest in otherwise participating in this proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties’ ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 4.5.1.

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English. The Panel would have accepted a Response in Chinese, but none was filed.

6.2 Substantive Issues

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must prove each of the following elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
- (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.

The burden of proof of each element is borne by the Complainant.

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. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the ICHOR and triangular device trademark for the purposes of the Policy. Given that the figurative element of the mark cannot be represented in a domain name for technical reasons, the Panel will disregard that element in its assessment of confusing similarity. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.2.1 and 1.10.

The entire textual element of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Despite the addition of the letters "sct" after the mark, the mark remains recognizable within the disputed domain name. The only other element in the disputed domain name is a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") extension (".com") which, as a standard requirement of domain name registration, may be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity for the purposes of the Policy. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7, 1.8, and 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

In the present case, the disputed domain name contains the textual element of the Complainant's ICHOR mark, and resolves to a website that prominently displays a logo featuring the ICHOR name, refers to ICHOR as a brand, and offers fluid control systems for the semiconductor industry, which is the same highly specialized field in which the Complainant operates. Despite the fact that the Respondent's logo is not identical to the Complainant's ICHOR mark, the website gives the impression that the website is affiliated with, or endorsed by, the Complainant. However, the Complainant submits that it has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to register or use the disputed domain name or its ICHOR mark. These circumstances indicate that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor is it making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Further, the Registrar has verified that the Respondent's company name is "伊扣（东莞）科技有限公司 (yikou dong guan ke ji you xian gong si)", which may be transliterated and translated as "Yikou (Dongguan) Technology Co., Ltd". That name does not correspond to the disputed domain name. While the website footer refers to "ICHOR (Dongguan) Science Co., Ltd.", which may be the same company, there is no evidence that the Respondent is known by that name, apart from in the website footer. The Respondent's

contact person's name does not resemble the disputed domain name. Nothing on the record indicates that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

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.

Based on the record, 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. The fourth of these is as follows:

"(iv) by using the [disputed] domain name, [the respondent has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent's] website or other online 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."

In the present case, the disputed domain name was registered in 2025, after the registration of the Complainant's ICHOR mark. The disputed domain name incorporates the entire textual element of that mark (i.e., "ichor"), which is not a standard transliteration of any Chinese characters. The website associated with the disputed domain name presents ICHOR as a brand in the field of fluid control systems for the semiconductor industry, which is the Complainant's highly specialized field. In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew of the Complainant's mark at the time when it registered the disputed domain name.

As regards use, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that is falsely presented as affiliated with, or endorsed by, the Complainant. It is evidently intended to attract Internet users searching for the Complainant's products and to divert them to the Respondent's website where it presents its own products. Given the findings in Section 6.2B above, the Panel finds that, by using the disputed domain name, 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 mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website or of a product or service on that website, within the terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Therefore, 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 <ichorsct.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Matthew Kennedy/

Matthew Kennedy

Sole Panelist

Date: October 28, 2026