

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108710

Case number CAC-UDRP-108710

Time of filing 2026-06-10 09:36:00

Domain names arkemateam.com

Case administrator

Name Olga Dvořáková (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization ARKEMA FRANCE

Complainant representative

Organization IN CONCRETO

Respondent

Organization Vandervort, Lakin and Durgan

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 owns the ARKEMA mark, which enjoys thorough protection through many registrations worldwide.

The Complainant is, inter alia, the owner of:

European trademark ARKEMA (word) registration No. 004181731 registered on February 9, 2006;
International trademark ARKEMA (word) registration No. 847.865 registered on November 30, 2004;
United States trademark ARKEMA (word) registration No. 3082057 registered on April 18, 2006.

The Complainant holds, directly or through its subsidiaries, multiple domain names that include the "ARKEMA" trademark, used to promote its activities and products, including: <arkema.com> (registered on 2001-05-21), <arkema.info> (registered on 2004-07-12), <arkema.eu> (registered on 2006-04-29), <arkema.fr> (registered on 2006-03-22) and <arkema.us> (registered on 2006-03-20).

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

FACTS ASSERTED BY THE COMPLAINANT AND NOT CONTESTED BY THE RESPONDENT:

The Complainant in this administrative proceeding is ARKEMA FRANCE, société anonyme (a public limited company). The

Complainant was incorporated as "ARKEMA FRANCE" in 2006. As of 2025, ARKEMA France is present in 55 countries worldwide with 154 production plants, over 20,700 employees and approximately € 9.1 billion in sales. The Complainant is a world leader in materials science, offering a wide range of products for various domains such as paints, adhesives, coats, glue, fiber, resins, raw materials and finished materials for both general industry and consumer goods.

The disputed domain name <arkemateam.com> was registered on May 19, 2026.

At the time of this decision the disputed domain is inactive. However, based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant, it appears that before the Complainant's takedown request, i.e on May 29, 2026, the disputed domain name "arkemateam.com" was reproducing the Complainant's website, and in particular the webpage detailing the presence of the Complainant in the USA.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that:

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks

The Complainant asserts that the addition of the term "team" is not sufficient to escape the finding that the domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark ARKEMA.

The Complainant concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its ARKEMA trademark.

The Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name

The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and that the Respondent is not affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant in any way.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and is not related to the Complainant's business in any way. The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor does it have any business dealings with, the Respondent.

The Complainant further contends that, before their takedown request, the disputed domain name was redirecting to a fraudulent website reproducing the Complainant's website, and that this is a typical case of impersonation and undeniable evidence that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name.

Therefore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith

The Complainant contends that the Respondent could not be unaware of the existence of the ARKEMA trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, not only because ARKEMA is a well-known trademark, but also in consideration of the nature of the domain name.

The Complainant further states that the Respondent's website was reproducing the Complainant's official website and that each link on the fraudulent website redirected the users to the Complainant's website, which is further evidence of the Respondent's intent to mislead the public and make them think there is a real connection between the disputed domain name and the Complainant.

Moreover, before the takedown request, e-mail servers had been configured to use the disputed domain name and this represented a threat that fraudulent emails could be sent by someone posing as a company employee.

RESPONDENT:

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).

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).

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).

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.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

A) Confusing similarity

The Panel finds the entirety of the Complainant's trademark is reproduced and recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy.

Although the addition of another term here, "team" may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such a term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's ARKEMA trademark for the purposes of the Policy.

Consequently, the disputed domain name appears to be confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

B) Lack of legitimate rights or interests

The disputed domain name is a distinctive, non-descriptive name. It is unlikely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without having the Complainant firmly in mind. The Complainant's assertions that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and is not affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant are sufficient to constitute a prima facie demonstration of the absence of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name on the part of the Respondent. The burden of evidence therefore shifts to the Respondent to show, using tangible evidence, that it does have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has made no attempt to do so.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

C) Registered or Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant gives sound bases for its contention that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith.

Firstly, owing to the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark and reputation, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks, and so the Panel finds on the balance of probabilities that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

Secondly, the Panel accepts the Complainant's unchallenged assertion that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the aim of creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark.

Thirdly, as underlined by the Complainant, this appears to be a typical case of impersonation. The Respondent's website was reproducing the Complainant's official website, specifically, it was displaying an identical copy of the Complainant's official webpage detailing the presence of the Complainant in the USA. This is further evidence that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and of its registration and use in bad faith.

Fourthly, a further indicator of bad faith may be inferred from the fact that the disputed domain name has been set up with MX records, which suggests that given the circumstances of the case, it may be actively used for sending fraudulent emails.

Finally, the Respondent has not responded to nor denied any of the assertions made by the Complainant in this proceeding.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **arkemateam.com**: Transferred
-

PANELLISTS

Name	Fabrizio Bedarida
------	--------------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION **2026-07-08**

Publish the Decision
