

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SYENSQO S.A. v. Keshai Holloway
Case No. D2024-3851

1. The Parties

The Complainant is SYENSQO S.A., Belgium, represented by Fencer BV, Belgium.

The Respondent is Keshai Holloway, United States of America (“United States”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The Disputed Domain Name <syensqos.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 20, 2024. On September 23, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 24, 2024, 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 24, 2024, 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 25, 2024.

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, and the proceedings commenced on October 1, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 21, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 22, 2024.

The Center appointed Tommaso La Scala as the sole panelist in this matter on October 28, 2024. 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 Belgium-based dynamic technology company specialized in advanced materials and chemical solutions and operating under the SYENSQO trademark.

SYENSQO has been registered as trademark in the European Union (no. 018888334, filed on June 14, 2023 and granted on October 31, 2023).

The Disputed Domain Name <syensqos.com> was registered on July 3, 2024 and is currently inactive, but it has been used in a phishing attempt whereby the Respondent tried to impersonate a Complainant's employee requesting Complainant's costumers to change the Complainant's banking details and wire their payments to another account.

The Complainant managed to take down the online contents on the Disputed Domain Name from the Registrar, given their phishing nature.

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.

The Complainant is the owner of multiple trademark registrations and domain names that consist of the mark SYENSQO.

The Disputed Domain Name fully incorporates such trademark with the mere addition of letter "s" and is therefore confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant confirms it has never assigned, granted, licensed, sold, transferred, or in any way authorized the Respondent to register or use the SYENSQO trademark in any manner. The Disputed Domain Name was registered in bad faith, since it incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, was registered without any authorization from the Complainant and it has been used for a purpose.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. The Panel finds the entirety of the mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, 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 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. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

The Complainant has shown that the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name without intent for commercial gain. Rather, the Respondent was engaged in an apparent phishing scheme to divert costumers’ payments toward the Complainant, by trying to impersonate the Complainant itself. Such use for fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests upon a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.

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

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 available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Generally speaking, a finding that a domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith requires an inference that a respondent has registered and is using the domain name at issue to take advantage of its significance as a trademark owned by the complainant. *Fifth Street Capital LLC v. Fluder (aka Pierre Olivier Fluder)*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-1747](#).

The Disputed Domain Name was registered after the Complainant first started using its SYENSQO trademark and the Complainant’s evidence establishes extensive use of its mark as at the date of registration of the Disputed Domain Name. Given the confusing similarity between the latter and the Complainant’s mark, it is clear that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its SYENSQO mark as at the date of registration of the Disputed Domain Name and registered it in order to take unfair advantage of it.

The Disputed Domain Name has been used for a phishing attempt which has been taken down by the relevant Registrar: accordingly – and as stated in *Bayer AG v. dasofun adura*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-0385](#) – “the Panel is satisfied that the Respondent most likely registered the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant and therefore for a dishonest purpose. ... As suggested by the Complainant, one may view the disputed domain name, in the hands of the Respondent, as an unjustifiable threat hanging over the head of the Complainant and thus constituting a current and continuing abusive use of the disputed domain name”.

The Panel agrees with the Complainant that the Respondent sought to disrupt the Complainant's costumers by impersonating one of its employees.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out, without limitation, circumstances which, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith. UDRP panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, fraud) constitutes bad faith (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4). Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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

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 <syensqos.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Tommaso La Scala/

Tommaso La Scala

Sole Panelist

Date: November 11, 2024