

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

PreZero Lizenz GmbH v. Rezero Limited

Case No. DIE2026-0005

1. The Parties

The Complainant is PreZero Lizenz GmbH, Germany, represented by gunnercooke GmbH, Germany.

The Respondent is Rezero Limited, Ireland.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <rezero.ie> is registered with IE Domain Registry Limited ("IEDR").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 10, 2026, via email. On June 12, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to IEDR a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 15, 2026, IEDR transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .IE Dispute Resolution Policy (the "IEDR Policy"), the WIPO Dispute Resolution Rules of Procedure for .IE Domain Name Registrations (the "Rules"), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .IE Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Supplemental Rules").

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2.1 and 4.1, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceeding commenced on June 25, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5.1, the due date for Response was July 23, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 3, 2026.

The Center appointed Alistair Payne as the sole panelist in this matter on August 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, based in Germany, is a large European environmental service provider with approximately 30,000 employees and about 470 locations across Europe. It undertakes waste management, recycling, packaging licensing, sustainability consulting services, and the production and supply of secondary raw materials, specifically certified plastic recyclates, granules, and pellets under the PREZERO mark.

The Complainant owns various trade mark registrations for its PREZERO mark, including European Union Trade Mark No. 018226551 registered on February 26, 2021. The Complainant also uses on its website a logo which includes the word mark “prezero. Circular. By Nature” for which it has a European Union trade mark registration No. 019302658 filed on January 13, 2026, and which matured into registration during the course of these proceedings, on July 30, 2026. It operates its official website at the domain name <prezero.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 25, 2025. It resolves to a website which features the REZERO mark and also the slogan “Circular by Nature” and which promotes, re-cycled products, in particular, acetate pellets and sheets.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant submits that its trade mark is a “protected identifier” under the IEDR Policy and that the disputed domain name wholly incorporates its PREZERO mark save for the first letter “p”. It submits that the omission of a single initial letter does not suffice to distinguish the disputed domain name from the protected identifier. It says that the visual, phonetic and conceptual similarity between PREZERO and “rezero” is exceptionally high and that the disputed domain name is therefore misleadingly similar to the PREZERO mark.

The Complainant submits that it has not authorised or licensed the Respondent to use the PREZERO mark or any confusingly similar designation. It further says that the Respondent does not hold any trade mark rights in the sign “rezero”. The Complainant notes that in early May 2025 the Respondent’s CEO filed an Irish trade mark application for REZERO which was subsequently deemed withdrawn following the Complainant’s opposition as the Respondent did not defend the application. The Complainant says that the Respondent cannot credibly claim legitimate interests in the disputed domain name when its own CEO and director declined to defend a trade mark application which was identical to the disputed domain name.

The Complainant notes that the disputed domain name resolves to a commercial website through which it offers plastic pellets and recyclates. The Complainant says that these products are protected by the Complainant’s registered trade mark described above (which specifically covers “raw plastics in the form of pellets” and “recycled compound plastics”) and that the Complainant actively manufactures and supplies these products to the plastics industry through its “PreZero Polymers” division. It says that using a confusingly similar domain name to offer directly competing goods covered by the Complainant’s mark cannot amount to a bona fide offering of goods under paragraph 3.1.1 of the IEDR Policy.

As far as bad faith is concerned the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 2.1.4 of the IEDR Policy, which provides that evidence of bad faith includes circumstances where the Respondent has, through its use of the domain name, “intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to a web site or other on-line location by creating a likelihood of confusion with a protected identifier in which the Complainant has rights.” In summary, the Complainant says that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to resolve to a website which features the REZERO mark to offer the same products, namely plastic pellets and recyclates as supplied by the Complainant under its PREZERO mark. It notes also that in September 2025 the Complainant featured the slogan “Circular By Nature” in its corporate communications on Linked In and only 11 days after the filing of its opposition to the

Respondent's Irish trade mark application for REZERO, the Respondent's website also featured the slogan "Circular by nature. Beautiful by design" on its front page, which, the Complainant says the Respondent continues to use at the date of filing of this Complaint. According to the Complainant this amounts to retaliatory or parasitic behaviour and demonstrates that the Respondent is deliberately seeking to mimic and create a likelihood of confusion which amounts to evidence of bad faith under paragraphs 2.1.4 and 2.1.5 of the IEDR Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Misleadingly Similar to a protected identifier in which the Complainant has rights

The Complainant has demonstrated that it owns a registered European Union trade mark for its PREZERO mark which protects the mark in Ireland and is a protected identifier under paragraph 1 of the IEDR Policy. The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is misleadingly similar to the Complainant's protected identifier as the omission of the letter "p" from the beginning of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding that the disputed domain name is misleadingly similar to the Complainant's protected identifier as the Complainant's protected identifier remains recognizable within the disputed domain name.

As a result, the Complaint succeeds under paragraph 1.1.1 of the IEDR Policy.

B. Rights in Law or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant has submitted that it has neither authorised nor licensed the Respondent to use the PREZERO mark or any confusingly similar designation. It has further submitted that the Respondent does not hold any trade mark rights in the sign "rezero". The Complainant has noted that in early May 2025 the Respondent's CEO filed an Irish trade mark application for REZERO which was subsequently deemed withdrawn following the Complainant's opposition. The Complainant has submitted that the Respondent cannot credibly claim legitimate interests in the disputed domain name when its own CEO and director declined to defend a trade mark application which was identical to the disputed domain name.

The Respondent's website at the disputed domain name is a commercial website which features the REZERO mark and which offers plastic pellets and recycles which the Complainant has submitted are similar or identical to its own products. At the date of filing, the website at the disputed domain name also featured a "Circular by nature" slogan, which is similar to the Complainant's slogan "Circular. By Nature.". The Respondent appears to have only adopted this slogan after the Complainant filed an opposition to the Respondent's Irish trade mark application for REZERO. Using a misleadingly similar disputed domain name to resolve to a website featuring a confusingly similar mark and slogan in order to promote very similar or identical goods to a pre-existing complainant's business is not consistent with the Respondent having rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that 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.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established its' case under paragraph 1.1.2 of the IEDR Policy.

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

Under paragraph 1.1.3 of the IEDR Policy the Complainant must demonstrate that the disputed domain name has either been registered, or is being used, in bad faith.

Under paragraph 2.1.4 of the IEDR Policy, evidence of registration or use in bad faith includes circumstances where the registrant has, through its use of the domain name, “intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to a web site or other on-line location by creating a likelihood of confusion with a protected identifier in which the Complainant has rights”.

The Complainant registered its PREZERO trade mark some years prior to the date of registration of the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that the PREZERO mark is distinctive in relation to plastic pellets or plastic recyclates.

In the Panel’s view, the Respondent has used the disputed domain name, which is misleadingly similar to the Complainant’s protected identifier, to attempt to confuse and redirect Internet users to its own website which also features the misleadingly similar or confusingly similar REZERO mark in relation to the promotion of identical or similar and competing goods. Upon arriving at the website at the disputed domain name, Internet users are likely only to be further confused into thinking that they are at the Complainant’s site or at least that the website has some affiliation with the Complainant by the Respondent’s use of a similar slogan to the Complainant’s “Circular. By Nature.” slogan in the context of the slogan “Circular by Nature.”. The timing of the Respondent’s first use of this slogan, some 11 days after the Complainant filed an opposition to the Respondent’s trade mark application, only reinforces the Panel’s view of the Respondent’s intent to confuse and attract Internet users to its website in terms of paragraph 2.1.4 of the IEDR Policy.

There is also evidence of bad faith under paragraph 2.1.5 of the IEDR Policy where a disputed domain name is used in a way which is likely to dilute the reputation of a trade mark in which the Complainant has rights.

The Respondent has chosen to use the disputed domain name which is highly similar to the Complainant’s registered trade mark to resolve to a website which uses the REZERO mark and which features a similar slogan to the Complainant’s slogan in order to promote and sell identical or similar plastic pellet or recyclate products. Internet users are likely to be confused into thinking that this website is the Complainant’s site or is affiliated with the Complainant and that the products being promoted from it are the Complainant’s, or are authorised by it, when this is not the case. This amounts to a likelihood of dilution of the reputation of the Complainant’s PREZERO trade mark in terms of paragraph 2.1.5 of the IEDR Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has also established its case under paragraph 1.1.3 of the IEDR Policy.

7. Decision

For all the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 5 of the IEDR Policy and 14 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <rezero.ie> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Alistair Payne/

Alistair Payne

Sole Panelist

Dated: August 19, 2026