

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Anthropic, PBC v. Miles David, Deel
Case No. D2025-5258

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Anthropic, PBC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Elster & McGrady LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Miles David, Deel, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <hiring-anthropic.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 16, 2025. On December 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 17, 2025, 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 (Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0176834955) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 18, 2025, 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 December 22, 2025.

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 December 29, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 18, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Nels T. Lippert as the sole panelist in this matter on January 22, 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 is a Delaware, United States, Public Benefit Corporation. It is a leading artificial intelligence (AI) safety and research company focused on building reliable, interpretable, and steerable AI systems. The Complainant has registered the domain name <anthropic.com> which resolves to a website that the Complainant uses to publish its documentation, research and information.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous United States trademark registrations for the ANTHROPIC trademark either in the standard character form or a stylized form where the letter “I” is replaced with a forward slash “/”. Representative examples of registrations of the ANTHROPIC mark include:

- United States Registration No. 7,491,942 registered on September 3, 2024;
- United States Registration No. 7,491,941 registered on September 3, 2024; and
- United States Registration No. 7,619,237 registered on December 24, 2024.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 3, 2025. At the time of filing of the Complaint and currently, the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive website that is indicated as under construction. The Complainant has also provided evidence that the disputed domain name has been used to send emails in relation to false interview and employment offers.

The Respondent appears to be an individual who resides in the United States and indicates that it is associated with an organization named Deel.

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 the ANTHROPIC trademark because it incorporates the Complainant’s ANTHROPIC mark in its entirety along with the generic term “hiring” and the “.com” Top-Level Domain. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because the Respondent has never operated a bona fide or legitimate business under the disputed domain name or has made a protected noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Rather the Complainant argues that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to send false interview and employment offers in the name of the Complainant, likely as a part of a scheme to steal sensitive personal information. The Complainant notes that the disputed domain name has active MX (mail exchange) records which indicate use of email to engage in fraudulent email or phishing communications. The Complainant further asserts that it has not granted the Respondent any license, permission or authorization by which it could own or use the ANTHROPIC mark or any confusingly similar mark.

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith because the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant as part of an employment scam. The Complainant notes that the Respondent sent communications using the Complainant’s branding and falsely claiming to be a senior recruiter for the Complainant or the

Complainant's Head of People as part of a phishing scheme meant to extract money or sensitive personal information from the recipient through deception.

The Complainant also argues that the Respondent has provided false contact details which is a further indication of bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

As noted above, the Respondent did not respond to the Complainant's allegations. Under the Rules, paragraphs 5(f) and 14(a), the effect of a default by the Respondent is that, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall proceed to a decision on the basis of the Complaint. The Panel does not find any exceptional circumstance in this case.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that in order to divest a respondent of a domain name, a complainant must demonstrate each of the following:

(i) the 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 domain name; and

(iii) the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Under paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, "[a] Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable".

In this case, the Panel finds that as a result of the Respondent's failure to submit a Response, the Respondent has failed to rebut any of the reasonable factual assertions that are made and supported by evidence submitted by the Complainant. By failing to respond, the Respondent has failed to offer the Panel any of the types of evidence set forth in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy or otherwise, from which the Panel might conclude that the Respondent has any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Moreover, the Respondent failed to provide any information or reasoning that might rebut the Complainant's arguments that the Respondent has acted in bad faith.

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.

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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, “hiring” and a hyphen “-” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Furthermore, it is well established that the applicable Top-Level Domain in a domain name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed as applicable to this case: phishing, impersonation/passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has not refuted any of the Complainant’s allegations of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name. In this case, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name to conduct illegal activities such as impersonating employees of the Complainant as part of an employment scam.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here claimed as applicable to this case: phishing, or impersonation/passing off constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. 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 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 <hiring-anthropic.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nels T. Lippert/

Nels T. Lippert

Sole Panelist

Date: February 2, 2026