Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108268

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108268
Time of filing	2025-12-29 09:56:08
Domain names	ChemBlocks.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Advanced Chemblocks, Inc.

Complainant representative

Organization	Dimov Internet Law Consulting

Respondent

Organization	Shanghai Sunway Pharmaceutical Technology Co., Ltd

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings which are pending or decided and which relate to the disputed domain name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant claims to be the licensed user of the registered U.S. trademark (Reg No. 6573245) ACHEMBLOCK ADVANCED CHEMBLOCKS INC, registered on 30 November 2021.

The trademark owner, Mr. Hongwang Du, licensed its use to the Complainant effective 10 December 2020.

The Complainant further provided extensive evidence showing continuous use of the trademark A CHEMBLOCK since 2009.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, Advanced Chemblocks, Inc., is a US based company that has operated under this name since at least 2009. It provides chemical products and services and has used the trademarks Advanced Chemblocks, Achemblock, and ACHEMBLOCK ADVANCED CHEMBLOCKS INC in commerce.

A business license issued in 2009 confirms the Complainant’s formation. In the same year, Mr. Hongwang Du registered the domain <achemblock.com>, which has been licensed to the Complainant. Internet Archive screenshots show use of <achemblock.com> for business purposes from at least 2011 through 2025.

The Respondent appears to be a company domiciled in Shanghai, China.

The disputed domain name was registered on 5 July 2013.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it.

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

The Complainant claims unregistered trademark rights in Advanced Chemblocks and Achemblock (hereinafter Achemblock) mark alongside its ACHEMBLOCK ADVANCED CHEMBLOCKS INC trademark registration. It has provided extensive evidence showing that Achemblock and related identifiers continuously has been used since at least 2009. The year-by-year invoices together with quotations, government forms, and public listings demonstrate longstanding and continuous commercial use.

In light of the above, the Panel is of the view that Complainant has proved that it has rights in the mark under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. See Avast Software s. r. o. v Milen Radumilo, 102384, (CAC 2019-03-12). See also paragraph 1.3 of WIPO Overview 3.0.

The Complainant further submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark. The Complainant asserts that the ".com" extension is disregarded for UDRP purposes, and that the dominant element "ChemBlocks" is identical to the core component of its trademarks. The Complainant further states that the additional descriptive terms "Advanced" and "Inc." do not reduce the distinctiveness of "ChemBlocks." In addition, the Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name differs by only two letters from the unregistered trademark "Achemblock," which is featured on the Complainant's domain name <achemblock.com>. Accordingly, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is either identical to or, at a minimum, confusingly similar to its trademarks.

- Complainant's trademark: ACHEMBLOCK ADVANCED CHEMBLOCKS INC
- Complainant's domain name: <achemblock.com>
- Disputed domain name: <chemblocks.com>

By doing a side-by-side comparison, the Panel agrees that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, see paragraph 1.7 of WIPO Overview 3.0. The Panel also notes that part of the website resolved by the disputed domain name is highly identical to Complainant's website in 2017. See paragraph 1.15 of WIPO Overview 3.0 ("In some instances, panels have however taken note of the content of the website associated with a domain name to confirm confusing similarity whereby it appears prima facie that the respondent seeks to target a trademark through the disputed domain name. Such content will often also bear on assessment of the second and third elements, namely whether there may be legitimate co-existence or fair use, or an intent to create user confusion. ")

The About Us Section of Complainant's website in 2017:

> **Advanced ChemBlocks** Inc is a research-based manufacturer and world-wide supplier of various novel advanced building blocks and research chemicals for drug discovery. We have a good working experience in the pharmaceutical industry, which helps us understand the needs of the medicinal chemist and the industry. We focus on various advanced building blocks having biological and pharmacological bias. Please see Product Category and New Products for the demon of part of our products.
>
> Most of our catalog products are available in sizes from gram-scale to semi-bulk quantity, no need to synthesize them. We can deliver them from 2-5 days domestically and 3-7 days internationally for the in stock items. Product quality is of paramount importance. We offer customers the highest quality and the purity in our building blocks.
>
> Custom synthesis is another important part of our business. We can make various organic chemicals from the milligram to kilogram scale at competitive price. Please see Custom synthesis page for more details.
>
> With the growth of our business and international connection with other suppliers, we also provide sourcing and manufacture service. Please feel free to contact us if you have any chemistry needs.
>
> We are a fast-paced company. Most enquiries can be answered in 2-24 hours.
>
> **Advanced ChemBlocks Inc** is a trusted, service-oriented company.

The About Us Section of the website resolved by the disputed domain name:

ChemBlocks Inc is a research-based manufacturer and world-wide supplier of various novel advanced building blocks and research chemicals for drug discovery. We have a good working experience in the pharmaceutical industry, which helps us understand the needs of the medicinal chemist and the industry. We focus on various advanced building blocks having biological and pharmacological bias. Please see Product Category and New Products for the demon of part of our products.

Most of our catalog products are available in sizes from gram-scale to semi-bulk quantity, no need to synthesize them. We can deliver them from 2-5 days domestically and 3-7 days internationally for the in stock items. Product quality is of paramount importance. We offer customers the highest quality and the purity in our building blocks.

Custom synthesis is another important part of our business. We can make various organic chemicals from the milligram to kilogram scale at competitive price. Please see Custom synthesis page for more details.

With the growth of our business and international connection with other suppliers, we also provide sourcing and manufacture service. Please feel free to contact us if you have any chemistry needs.

We are a fast-paced company. Most enquiries can be answered in 2-24 hours.

ChemBlocks Inc is a trusted, service-oriented company.

For the foregoing reasons, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Respondent to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy). More specifically, the Complainant must first make a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and the burden of proof then shifts to the Respondent to show it does have rights or legitimate interests. See PepsiCo, Inc. v Smith power production, 102378, (CAC 2019-03-08) ("The Panel finds that the Complainant has made out a prima facie case that arises from the considerations above. All of these matters go to make out the prima facie case against the Respondent. As the Respondent has not filed a Response or attempted by any other means to rebut the prima facie case against it, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.").

The Complainant submits that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name cannot be bona fide. The Complainant contends that the "About Us" section of the website is copied verbatim from the Complainant's 2017 website, that the website copies the Complainant's layout and operates in the same field, and that infringing content was still published as of 5 December 2025. The Complainant further asserts that the domain name <achemblock.com>, which it owns, is confusingly similar to the disputed domain name, differing by only two letters, indicating that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to mislead the public into believing it is associated with the Complainant. The Complainant also states that the Respondent is not commonly known as "ChemBlocks" and has used misleading copyright notices, including "Copyright 2015 CHEMICAL BLOCKS INC," which precludes any claim of being commonly known by the disputed domain name. Finally, the Complainant contends that the website is commercial and intentionally misleading, and that the Respondent's use to divert customers and benefit from confusion cannot constitute legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. See Guangdong Qisitech CO., LTD. v. Katie Hudson, 107432 (CAC 2025-04-29) ("By copying the content of the Complainant's website, the Respondents have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to their websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's GEEK BAR trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites. Such conduct is contrary to a bona fide offering of goods or services and does not constitute a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain names.").

As a result, the burden of proof shifts to the Respondent to demonstrate such rights or interests. However, the Respondent has failed to submit any official response within the required timeframe to rebut these assertions.

For the foregoing reasons, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant states that it has operated under the name Advanced Chemblocks, Inc. since 2009, has used the domain name <achemblock.com> since 2009, and has maintained a website associated with that domain name since at least 2011, with its marks being publicly used. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent selected a domain name identical to the distinctive portion of the Complainant's trademarks and highly similar to <achemblock.com>, demonstrating knowledge of and targeting the Complainant. The Complainant

further contends that the Respondent has intentionally attracted users for commercial gain by creating confusion with the Complainant's marks, including copying the Complainant's "About Us" text, replicating its website design and industry positioning, publishing false copyright notices, and continuing to use infringing content in 2025. The Complainant also emphasizes that the Respondent's registration of a domain name differing by only two letters from <achemblock.com> indicates a clear intent to mislead. The Complainant submits that the use of a domain name proxy service further supports a finding of bad faith. Finally, the Complainant asserts that, even if the Complainant's trademark rights were nascent or unregistered at the time of registration, the Respondent's actions constitute bad faith under UDRP standards, as the Respondent clearly knew of the Complainant's existing or nascent trademark rights and intentionally sought to capitalize on them.

Having considered the circumstances and noting the Respondent's failure to submit a Response, the Panel finds that the Respondent has offered no plausible justification for registering the disputed domain name or for copying content from the Complainant's website. It is more likely than not that the Respondent had prior knowledge of the Complainant and its website at the time of registration. By using the Disputed Domain Name, the Respondent intentionally sought to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Disputed Domain Name by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website. See Siemens Trademark GmbH & Co. K v. CONTA LOJAS & Njalla Okta LLC , 107336 (CAC 2025-04-09) and paragraph 3.3 of WIPO Overview 3.0.

For the foregoing reasons, the Panel finds the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

The Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under UDRP were met and there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS - PROCEDURAL ORDER NO.1 & LANGUAGE OF PROCEEDING:

The Panel notes that the language of the Registration Agreements is Chinese, as confirmed by the Registrar. The official Complaint was submitted in English. Pursuant to paragraph 11 of the Rules, unless otherwise agreed by the Parties, or specified otherwise in the Registration Agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the Registration Agreement. However, this is subject to the authority of the Panel to determine otherwise, having regard to the circumstances of the administrative proceeding.

The Panel is bilingual and fully capable of conducting the proceeding in both Chinese and English.

The Respondent submitted an email to the CAC asserting that it lacks sufficient proficiency in English to understand the Complaint and to file a Response in that language.

The Panel issued Procedural Order No. 1 bilingually in English and Chinese, requesting the Complainant to provide reasons for requesting that the language of the proceeding be English and allowing the Respondent to submit a Response to the Complainant's submission.

One the same day, the Complainant submitted Reasons for requesting the language of proceeding be changed to English arguing that the website associated with the disputed domain name is entirely in English, with no Chinese language content, and that the disputed domain name itself consists of English words. The Complainant further states that the Respondent uses an email address containing the English word "sales" indicating engagement with English-speaking customers. The Complainant asserts that it is based in the United States, where English is the official language and that it has submitted extensive documentary evidence in English, including claims relating to a United States unregistered trademark, such that translation would impose a significant burden. The Complainant also contends that the disputed domain name is likely to cause confusion among English-speaking Internet users particularly in the United States.

Within the required period of time, the Respondent submitted neither a response to Procedural Order No.1 nor to the Complaint of the present case.

The Panel agrees that the website resolved by the disputed domain name is in English language and there is no evidence to suggest that using English as the language of the proceeding would be unfair to the Respondent. See Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd. v. ceng ju ying, 108243 (CAC 2026-01-14).

Having considered the circumstances and noting the Respondent's failure to submit a response, the Panel concludes that the use of English as the language of the proceeding would be fair to both parties and would serve the UDRP's objective of facilitating the swift resolution of disputes. Accordingly, the Panel determines that the language requirement has been satisfied, and that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

Having established all three elements required under the Policy, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name should be transferred to the Complainant.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

AND THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME(S) IS (ARE) TO BE

1. **ChemBlocks.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Mr Paddy TAM**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-01-29

Publish the Decision