

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

DASSAULT SYSTEMES v. Shivakumar chandrappa, Universal Values Case No. DAI2026-0052

1. The Parties

The Complainant is DASSAULT SYSTEMES, France, represented by Cabinet Regimbeau, France.

The Respondent is Shivakumar chandrappa, Universal Values, India, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <meditwin.ai> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 10, 2026. On June 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 12, 2026, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 15, 2026, 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 June 18, 2026.

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 June 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 9, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on June 17, 2026. The Respondent requested, on June 19, 2026, an additional four calendar days in which to respond to the Complaint as per paragraph 5(b) of the Rules, and the Center granted the extension on the same day, and the new due date for Response was July 13, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on July 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrew D. S. Lothian as the sole panelist in this matter on July 15, 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 European company with its headquarters in France. It describes itself as a multinational software company and a global leader in 3D design, engineering, and product lifecycle management solutions. It notes that it was founded in 1981, operates worldwide, and has approximately 25,000 employees across more than 180 sites.

The Complainant is the owner of at least two registered trademarks for the mark MEDITWIN, namely:

- French Registered Trademark Number 4878048 for the word mark MEDITWIN, filed on June 17, 2022, and registered (“Enregistrement avec modification”) on November 18, 2022, in Classes 9, 38, 41, 42 and 44; and

- International Registered Trademark Number 1732849 for the word mark MEDITWIN, registered on December 15, 2022, in Classes 9, 38, 41, 42, and 44, designated in respect of six countries or territories, with protection currently granted in five. This mark is not designated in respect of India, where the Respondent is based.

The Complainant states (with the provision of only limited supporting evidence in the form of a Google search) that its MEDITWIN trademark is used to designate an advanced healthcare innovation initiative, focused on transforming medical practice through the use of virtual twins, these being digital representations of a patient’s body, organs, or biological systems, built from real-world medical data such as imaging, clinical records, and genetic information.

The Complainant’s Google search (in the French language rather than in the language of the proceeding) for the term “MEDITWIN” (capitalized as such, and searched without quotation marks) dated June 8, 2026, is performed from a Paris, France, IP address with personalization switched on. This places the Complainant’s use of its mark in the first result, pointing to the Complainant’s official website at “www.3ds.com”. As far as the Panel can tell from the search abstracts (the 10 search results were not followed up by the Complainant with any screenshots of the resulting websites) the results provided appear to refer to the Complainant’s MEDITWIN digital health project.

The Complainant lists some 10 offices which it maintains in India, although it does not specify the extent to which the MEDITWIN project has been expanded to India or is in use, marketed, or otherwise known in that country.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 23, 2025. According to a screenshot provided by the Complainant, dated June 9, 2026, the website associated with the disputed domain name appeared at that date to be a partially completed site offering the service of building a “Medical Twin” which aggregates an individual’s health records and uses artificial intelligence (“AI”) with an interactive 2D visualization to provide patterns and insights. The Respondent produces a greater number of screenshots of the said website (undated but the Panel presumes these to be contemporaneous to the filing of the Response). These show a more complete site under the headline “Transform your health journey with your Personal Digital Twin” which states that it is in English and 10 Indian languages. The product described on said site is an AI-powered personal health record which is “always in your pocket”. Screenshots of the logged-in dashboard show an interactive body map and ability to scan and upload medical reports into the platform which form part of a personal document management system.

The Respondent is an individual, and founder of a company named OmniThrive Technologies Private Limited, incorporated in India on July 31, 2024. The Respondent provides multiple corporate documents relating to this company along with two invoices showing that said company is engaged in active trading in connection with software engineering. Said company maintains an official website at “www.omnithrivetech.com”, on which a product page is featured at the URL: “www.omnithrivetech.com/products/meditwin” for its product named either “MediTwin” or “Medi Twin” (the spacing used appears to be variable). The Respondent’s name and a link to its personal LinkedIn page are provided in the said website’s contact details, along with the corporate information for OmniThrive Technologies Private Limited.

The Respondent shows by way of Google Scholar searches for “medical digital twin” and a Google search “Medi twin in india [sic]” (both searches conducted without quotations and presumably emanating from an Indian IP address) that the descriptive term “digital twin” is in widespread use in connection with healthcare applications, in India and elsewhere. The said Google search returns references to the website associated with the disputed domain name and to the Complainant’s official website as the only returns directly using the term “MediTwin” or “MEDITWIN”. The remaining returns refer to medical digital twin technology, healthcare digital twins, and unrelated terms such as “Mediwin”.

The Respondent shows with reference to screenshots from “www.github.com”, including metadata retrieved by one of its developers, that it created various initial software repositories for its “MediTwin” project on April 23, 2025. It also shows with reference to a WhatsApp group chat export that it created a group called “Meditwin.ai” on April 27, 2025, which sets out what the Respondent says are discussions among its development team from that date to March 7, 2026, concerning its “MediTwin” project. The various chats appear to the Panel to be typical development team discussions, including some conversations relating to specific functionalities of the Respondent’s said project and to the team’s plans for “the MVP” (in the Panel’s experience, this is a developer acronym for “minimum viable product”, being a version of a product with basic features on which potential customers can provide feedback).

The Respondent describes and evidences its selection and registration of the disputed domain name on April 23, 2025. A timeline may be created from the Respondent’s WhatsApp messages (in a series dating between April 14, 2025, and April 24, 2026), together with its timed personal search history in its Google “My Activity” record. Taking these together, the Panel has created the following timeline for the said date of registration of the disputed domain name. Where items have the same timestamp, the Panel has endeavored to place them where they make the most sense contextually. The Panel has reproduced the WhatsApp messages exactly as they appear in the Respondent’s documentary annex and has not altered these for spelling or grammar, which is variable given the informal nature of the communications.

At 10:49 p.m., in conversation with its backend developer and co-founder, “Raj”, the Respondent states, “I want to give a name to the code repositories”, – “do you have suggestion” – “how does MediTwin sound to you?”

At 10:50 p.m., Raj replies, “Something like digi twin or twin health or Digihealth”. This message crosses with the Respondent’s suggestion above regarding MediTwin, to which Raj then replies “Yes!!”.

Also at 10:50 p.m., the Respondent performs a search for “MediTwin in India”.

Still at 10:50 p.m., the Respondent replies, “but just do a google search with this name” – “there are a ton of web pages that comes up already” – “finding a unique name is hard”

At 10:51 p.m., Raj replies, “Yeah even I tried” – “All the names are registered”.

At 10:52 p.m., the Respondent replies, “I will use meditwin to name the github repositories, we will finalise the name of the product later”.

At 10:56 p.m., the Respondent searches for and visits the login page for Slack (a team collaboration platform often used by software developer teams).

At 11:12 p.m., the Respondent searches for synonyms for the word “twin”.

At 11:13 p.m., the Respondent searches for and visits the login page for <namecheap.com> (a domain name registrar).

Also at 11:13 p.m., the Respondent searches for and visits “www.thesaurus.com” and consults synonyms and antonyms for the word “twin”.

At 11:17 p.m., the Respondent sends a further WhatsApp message to Raj, “[the disputed domain name] is available” – “I mean the domain [name]”.

At 11:18 p.m., the Respondent adds “wondering how its not taken already”.

Still at 11:18 p.m., Raj replies, “Is a good opportunity, you should take it”.

At 11:34 p.m., the Respondent sends a screenshot showing a successful registration via the Registrar, adding “[the disputed domain name] is ours for next two years” – “I think it’s a great domain, hope we make the best use of it”.

At 11:35 p.m., the Respondent adds, “its just 8 characters, and I think its super valuable for us, as it accurately represent what we plan to build”.

At 11:35 p.m., the Respondent adds, “this is the best domain [name] I owned so far, and I am super excited about what we can build” – “its so catchy, I still can’t believe it was available to buy”.

Between 11:43 and 11:44, the Respondent consults domain name and keyword ranking information and/or tools.

At 11:50 p.m., Raj replies, “Congratulations, I think it’s a sign to start a new beginning, perfect for the product We are building”.

At 11:57 p.m., the Respondent searches for whether “.ai” is an advantage or disadvantage.

At 11:58 p.m., the Respondent searches for “how do you rate [the disputed domain name]?” and repeats the “.ai” advantage or disadvantage search.

Finally, also at 11:58 p.m., the Respondent repeats the search for “meditwin in India” (note, this search is not capitalized unlike that at 10:50 p.m.). This ends the timeline of April 23, 2025.

The Respondent shows that it applied to take part in the Indian Government’s National Health Authority’s Digital Health Incentive Scheme for ABDM (Ayushman Bharat Digital Mission) on June 6, 2026, which scheme is open to digital solution companies supporting, inter alia, “Seamless access to patient’s longitudinal health records”. The Respondent shows that its application was approved and that its access to “ABDM Sandbox Integration” was granted on June 17, 2026.

The Respondent claims that “medi-” is a widely used prefix in health product and health service names, quoting (but not evidencing) the use of “MediBuddy”, “Medanta”, “Mediclaime”, “Medimix”, and pharmaceutical product names such as “Medimol” and “Mediphylline”. The Respondent also provides a hyperlink showing that medical castors are manufactured by a third party based in Australia under the name “Medi Twin Series”, which the Panel has verified by following the said hyperlink.

The Respondent also references the Complainant's mention of a third party MEDI TWIN trademark in the Republic of Korea (the Complainant's Annex 9), although the Panel's search of the related trademark register does not show any active marks and identifies this as a likely trademark application dated March 8, 2023, for the mark HUMEDI TWIN and device, application number 40-2023-0040808, which has since been abandoned.

The Respondent sets out in tabular form a feature by feature comparison between the Parties' products. Broadly speaking, these show that the Complainant's "virtual twin" involves advanced clinical capabilities including digital replicas of organs and 3D biological system models, while the Respondent's offering consists of health record management and visualization, including a 2D body diagram representing a person's health data.

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 identical to its registered trademarks for the word mark MEDITWIN. It notes that the country code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".ai" refers to Anguilla but states that the letters also stand for "artificial intelligence", and says that this ccTLD is widely used for websites offering products and services related to artificial intelligence. The Complainant contends that its MEDITWIN solutions utilize artificial intelligence and that the Respondent has therefore registered a domain name identical to the Complainant's trademark in conjunction with a ccTLD relevant to the Complainant's business activities, goods and services.

The Complainant states that the Respondent has no connection with the Complainant, is not an authorized dealer, distributor or licensee of the Complainant and has not been authorized by the Complainant to use its MEDITWIN trademarks, and asserts that in the absence of any license or authorization from the Complainant to use the latter's trademark, no legitimate or bona fide use, actual or contemplated, of the domain name can reasonably be claimed or inferred.

The Complainant further contends that before any notice of the dispute, the Respondent had not used the disputed domain name or any name corresponding thereto in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor had it made any serious preparations to do so. Further, the Respondent does not have any rights in any trademarks containing the term MEDITWIN.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent is not making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name and that, on the contrary, the Respondent intends to divert the public targeted by the Complainant's trademarks for commercial gain by creating confusion, thereby tarnishing the Complainant's trademarks.

The Complainant contends that the website associated with the disputed domain name offers solutions based on digital twins for the healthcare sector that utilize AI and that these solutions are identical to the goods and services protected by the Complainant's MEDITWIN trademarks and to the solutions offered by the Complainant under those trademarks. The Complainant contends that the Respondent is therefore knowingly offering solutions that infringe the Complainant's trademarks and that the use of a domain name for illegal purposes (e.g., the sale of counterfeit goods or unauthorized medications, phishing/identity theft, the distribution of malware, unauthorized account access/hacking, sites imitating other trademarks, unfair competition, or other types of fraud) cannot confer any rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. The Complainant notes that some panels have held that trademark infringement (properly argued and proven) would render a use illegitimate under the Policy, which the Complainant contends is the case here.

The Complainant asserts that the name used on the website associated with the disputed domain name is strictly identical to the Complainant's trademark, and the solutions offered on the website are identical or, at the very least, very similar to the goods and services protected by the Complainant's prior trademark, which is likely to create a risk of confusion in the minds of the public. The Complainant therefore contends that use of this trademark on the website constitutes an infringement of the Complainant's prior trademark rights.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant submits that by registering a domain name containing the term "meditwin", and offering solutions identical to those protected by the Complainant's prior trademarks, the Respondent could not have been unaware of the Complainant's prior rights in the MEDITWIN trademark and therefore knowingly registered the disputed domain name in order to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website or other online space belonging to it, thereby creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks.

The Complainant notes that the Respondent is based in India and although acknowledging that the Complainant does not have any trademark registrations for MEDITWIN in India, it asserts that it is active in this country and has several offices there. The Complainant further asserts that since the services protected by its MEDITWIN trademark can be provided online, they can also be provided to Indian consumers, and accordingly the Respondent could not ignore the existence of the Complainant and of its international trademark registration for MEDITWIN which, the Complainant contends, confirms that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the Respondent's use of a privacy service, thereby preventing the Complainant from obtaining the Respondent's identity and contact information, demonstrates that the Respondent specifically sought to intentionally block or delay the disclosure of his identity and contact information, which is a further indication that the registration was made in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent does not dispute that, for the limited purpose of the first element, the disputed domain name is identical or similar to the Complainant's registered MEDITWIN word mark but contends that the Complainant has not satisfied the second and third elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent contends that it has rights and legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, based on concrete, contemporaneous, and independently verifiable evidence establishing a bona fide offering of goods and services under Policy, together with demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name that pre-date any notice of the present dispute by more than a year.

In particular, the Respondent contends that it is the founder and a director of OmniThrive Technologies Private Limited, incorporated in India nearly nine months before the disputed domain name was registered and almost two years before the present Complaint was filed. Said company is engaged in the business of developing information technology software services and products and the Respondent asserts that "MediTwin" is the only consumer product it is developing, alongside the company's software engineering services, and it has registered no other trademark-related domain names. The Respondent states that its operation of "MediTwin" is presently confined to India.

The Respondent contends that "MediTwin" is a descriptive composite of the ordinary words "medical" and "twin", corresponding to the widely used concept of a "medical digital twin" and that the Respondent adopted it for its plain descriptive meaning in connection with a genuine health technology application, and not by reference to, or with any knowledge of, the Complainant or its MEDITWIN mark.

The Respondent states that it adopted the name because it accurately describes its product, as the product interface makes explicit (“Your body. Your history. One visual story.”; “your Personal Digital Twin”). The Respondent submits that a respondent who adopts a descriptive term for its ordinary meaning, in connection with a product embodying that meaning, has a legitimate interest in doing so.

The Respondent further contends that the website associated with the disputed domain name hosts the live, operational application which is a personal health-records product that allows an individual to upload their own medical reports and view them organized on an interactive 2D body map, a health timeline, and a searchable medical-history view, with AI generated summaries and an optional facility to share records with a treating doctor. The Respondent claims to be actively integrating the product with India’s own national digital health infrastructure and asserts that this government-facing integration effort which is directed at India’s own health infrastructure and wholly unrelated to the Complainant, further confirms a bona fide offering with its own independent commercial rationale.

Further, the Respondent demonstrates that it has undertaken to onboard MediTwin to the Government of India’s Ayushman Bharat Digital Mission (ABDM) which it states is India’s national digital-health ecosystem, as a “Digital Solution Company.” The Respondent notes that it applied for and received ABDM Sandbox access prior to notice to the Respondent of the present dispute.

The Respondent further contends that it has provided evidence which demonstrates clear contemporaneous evidence of bona fide pre-complaint preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with an offering of services. In particular, it states that on April 23, 2025, the date that the disputed domain name was registered, it immediately created three GitHub repositories named “meditwin-frontend”, “meditwin-backend”, and “meditwin-agents”, for use in the development of the MediTwin application and that development of the said application continues to the present day. The Respondent contends that said repositories constitute clear contemporaneous evidence of bona fide pre-complaint preparations.

The Respondent notes that the prefix “medi-” is a commonplace shorthand for “medical” routinely combined with ordinary words to form health product names (for example “MediBuddy”, “Mediclam”, and “Medimix”), so that pairing it with the standard term “twin” is an obvious descriptive construction that different parties arrive at independently. The Respondent asserts that the terms “medical digital twin” and “digital twin healthcare” are in widespread use and are even registered by third parties in the medical field, noting that an unrelated Australian medical-products company markets a range of medical castors under the name “Medi Twin Series”. The Respondent submits that the fact that unrelated parties have repeatedly combined these ordinary elements is significant. It asserts that if numerous independent undertakings have arrived at the same “medi” plus “twin” pairing, the Respondent’s independent adoption of it calls for no special explanation and indicates that the term is descriptive and non-exclusive and not distinctive of any single undertaking.

The Respondent denies that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. In particular, the Respondent asserts that its contemporaneous evidence of the WhatsApp discussions and online searches which led to the adoption of the term demonstrates that it conceived of the “MediTwin” term independently and without any reference to the Complainant’s mark or any intention to target same.

The Respondent notes that the Complainant has no trademark in India for MEDITWIN. Further, it asserts that a Google search carried out immediately prior to the registration of the disputed domain name for “MediTwin in india” [sic] returned only generic, descriptive results and no reference to the Complainant, and accordingly the Respondent’s own research in India did not disclose the Complainant or its mark. The Respondent therefore contends that it is not the case that it must have known of the Complainant’s mark prior to registration of the disputed domain name and it denies targeting the Complainant or its mark.

The Respondent submits that use of a privacy service is not evidence of bad faith. It notes that privacy and proxy registration services are used by millions of registrants for legitimate reasons, including the avoidance of spam and the protection of personal data, and their use is recognized as commonplace and

not inherently indicative of bad faith. The Respondent contends that the underlying registrant is a genuine business which promptly identified itself, engaged fully, and came forward with a detailed, documented good-faith account, and the mere use of a standard privacy feature adds nothing to the Complainant's case.

The Respondent asserts that it has not attempted to impersonate the Complainant and that the website associated with the disputed domain name does not reference or seek to imitate the Complainant or its products. The Respondent notes that the Complainant has offered no evidence of actual confusion and submits that there is no plausible mechanism for confusion between a French industrial simulation enterprise's specialized initiative and an Indian startup's consumer health-records application.

The Respondent contends that the four circumstances in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy are all absent and concludes that it has invested substantial time and money over more than a year in building and operating a genuine product available at the disputed domain name, which it adds is conduct fundamentally incompatible with bad faith.

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 Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

In the comparison exercise above, the ".ai" ccTLD is typically disregarded as required for technical reasons. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel notes in passing that the Respondent effectively concedes this element, noting that the focus of its case is on the second and third elements of the Policy.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The essence of the Complainant's position on this topic is that the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its MEDITWIN trademark, that the Respondent has not used either the disputed domain name or a corresponding name for a bona fide offering of goods or services (and has not made any serious preparations to do so), furthermore, that the Respondent is knowingly offering services infringing the Complainant's trademark, and that the Respondent's activities create a risk of confusion.

The essence of the Respondent's position is that it is making a bona fide offering of goods and services under the name "MediTwin" in connection with a genuine health technology application (unrelated to the Complainant's offering under the MEDITWIN mark and unlikely to be confused with such) with demonstrable preparations to do so predating notice of the Complaint to it by over a year, and that it conceived the said name independently of the Complainant's mark based upon a descriptive lexical blend of the words "medical" and "twin".

It appears to the Panel from the extensive evidence produced by the Respondent that, before notice to it of the dispute, it has indeed been making demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The case exhibits a somewhat unusually replete evidential record from the Respondent's side surrounding the registration of the disputed domain name giving rise to a timeline composed of WhatsApp messages and Google searches (furthermore, the WhatsApp messages also cover a much wider period up to March/April 2026). From this, the Respondent's activities relating to its alleged independent conception of the name "MediTwin" may be replayed, on a minute by minute basis. Beyond the timeline itself, the Respondent also exhibits its WhatsApp communications with its development team and extracts of its software code repository showing the Respondent's active participation in the creation of a "minimum viable product" under the name concerned. This is the product shown in the Respondent's screenshots of the landing page at the website associated with the disputed domain name, together with the pages visible to an authenticated user. All of this evidence paints a picture of the Respondent's software company's creation of an online platform featuring the user's "medical twin" or "digital twin" created from the user's uploaded, scanned, visualized and AI-processed digital medical records, descriptively named "MediTwin" or "Medi Twin".

Reviewing in detail the evidence of timing and circumstances of the Respondent's adoption of the name concerned, the Panel notes that on the day that the disputed domain name was registered, the timeline shows initially that the Respondent was seeking some form of descriptive name which would reflect its "twin" concept along with a descriptor reflecting the fact that the system it proposed to build was in the health sector and related to the aggregation of medical records. The Respondent appears to alight on the term "MediTwin" (rejecting its colleague's suggestions of "digi twin", "twin health"²⁰ and "Digihealth") and searches for the former's existence with an India-focused search.

While the Respondent proceeds to note that "a ton of web pages" appear online, there is no suggestion on the present record that it saw entries for the Complainant or, more importantly, that it deliberately selected the term because of its association with the Complainant or the Complainant's mark. Indeed, there is no discussion of the Complainant and/or its mark at any time in the various exchanges. The Respondent next decides to temporarily name its software repository accordingly, and then considers alternative synonyms for "twin" while checking availability of domain names. When the disputed domain name is noted to be available, the Respondent registers it and further discusses with its colleague the benefits that it perceives, namely that the disputed domain name is short and "catchy", whereby the Respondent is surprised to have found it still available. Even then, the Respondent decides to search as to whether the ".ai" ccTLD should be considered an advantage or a disadvantage for its particular choice.

The above evidence, taken together, suggests an iterative domain name selection process to the Panel that in no way references the Complainant's mark or deliberately seeks to take any advantage from it. The record shows clear, contemporaneous (dated) evidence of bona fide pre-complaint preparations which are not merely self-serving but rather are inherently credible and supported by other relevant pre-complaint evidence. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.2.

It is unclear on the present record whether the Google search performed by the Respondent would have disclosed the Complainant's mark, noting however that the corresponding search performed by the Respondent on July 5, 2026, does produce a return for the Complainant's official website at the sixth result.¹ That said, knowledge of the Complainant's mark would not be enough on its own in the present case to render the Respondent's offering of goods or services (or any preparations therefor) something less than bona fide. Even if the Respondent had encountered the Complainant's mark in the course of its search, the contemporaneous evidence before the Panel does not suggest that this played any material

¹ Based upon the timeline, the Respondent was focused at the material time on finding a suitable domain name incorporating the term "meditwin" or other "twin" synonyms, and the entry for the Complainant's official website in the July 2026 search results, while referencing the Complainant's MEDITWIN trademark, in fact points to the Complainant's official website at "www.3ds.com," the domain name for which does not itself incorporate said mark. The result also mentions "French science and technology" despite the Respondent's search for "MediTwin in India". In other words, given the terms of its India-specific search, it is by no means certain that the Respondent would have particularly focused upon such an entry or considered it to be significant even if it had seen it.

role in the Respondent's decision to adopt the disputed domain name. Fundamentally, there is nothing on the present record to suggest that the Respondent identified and selected the term "MediTwin" because it is the Complainant's mark, even if it might have seen such mark in passing on the Google search.

On the contrary, the notion that the Respondent independently selected "MediTwin" as a portmanteau, which is descriptive of its medical records aggregation service, seems to the Panel to be reasonably plausible, noting also that "medi" appears to be an accepted abbreviation for "medical" and that at least one other entity besides the Parties seems to have coined the term "Medi Twin Series" for a product with an intended medical use, albeit that the "twin" component may refer to the "series" of castors, rather more than to the "medi" aspect. In any event, the widespread concept of a "medical digital twin" can explain the Respondent's contraction of this expression to "MediTwin". The Respondent seems to have decided to focus on the term's use in India in its Google search, most likely because its product is at least at this stage intended for the Indian marketplace (noting the Indian languages provision on the website associated with the disputed domain name, and the Respondent's participation in the Indian Government's National Health Authority's Digital Health Incentive Scheme). It should also be noted that while the Respondent's preparations date back over a year before notice to it of the Complaint, the Respondent was continuing actively to pursue its "MediTwin" business shortly before the Complaint was filed, as demonstrated by its application on June 6, 2026, to take part in such Digital Health Incentive Scheme, which application appears ultimately to have been successful.

Turning briefly to the Complainant's submissions on this topic, the Panel does not agree that the Respondent's preparations to use the disputed domain name and corresponding name are not serious, i.e., that they are in some way deliberately contrived or a pretext for cybersquatting. The record strongly indicates otherwise, and contains multiple different examples of mutually corroborating evidence supporting the Respondent's position. The Panel does not consider that the Respondent is or was knowingly offering goods infringing the Complainant's trademark. Indeed, the Complainant candidly admits in its submissions relative to registration and use in bad faith that it has no trademark rights in India, and there is no evidence before the Panel demonstrating that the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant's trademark rights elsewhere when it registered the disputed domain name.

The Complainant adds that the Respondent's use of the term "MediTwin" creates a risk of confusion because the Parties are operating in the same sector under an identical mark offering broadly the same services. On this matter, the Panel accepts the Respondent's submissions that the Complainant's offering is fundamentally a different product relating to the 3D visualization of organs, etc., focused on clinical medical practice. This may or may not be capable of confusion with the Respondent's India-focused digital health records aggregation service, focused on consumers, although it would be clear to most interested parties that the Parties' services are not the same, and have very different characteristics, purposes, and functions, even if they operate in the same (medical) sector, broadly speaking. More importantly, any confusion that does arise would be caused by the Parties' inadvertent selection of the same name as a consequence of their respective legitimate interests and not from any deliberate action, including cybersquatting behavior, on the Respondent's part.

The Panel finds that, before notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the Respondent made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.2.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has not been established, and the Complaint fails.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Although the Complaint has failed on the second element of the Policy, for completeness, the Panel will also make an assessment under the third element.

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 the Complainant's position that the Respondent knowingly registered the disputed domain name in order to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of such website. This is effectively a submission in terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, which would require prior knowledge of the Complainant's mark on the Respondent's part, together with an intent to target the same.

The Complainant's case fails on this topic, largely because it has not provided any evidence supporting the extent and reach of its MEDITWIN trademark, and notably due to the fact that it has provided no information as to its use in India even if the Complainant has not registered any trademark in that country, as it candidly admits. While the Complainant made a variety of conclusory allegations in its submissions as to the nature of its use of said mark, it failed to support these with any evidence beyond a single Google search. That search was conducted from a Paris, France IP address, and contained personalized results.² This can only tell the Panel how the Complainant's mark appears on a Google search geo-targeted to the location of the Complainant's headquarters, which may conceivably be skewed further by the use of the searcher's personalized results, themselves influenced by its past search and website visiting history.

While the Panel doubts that any Google search on its own would necessarily have been sufficient to establish the reach of the Complainant's mark, the preferable search in evidential terms would have been a search from an Indian IP address, time-limited to the period leading up to the registration date of the disputed domain name, with personalized results excluded. Besides the Complainant's localized French search, which in no way assists the Panel on this topic, all that the Complainant tells the Panel is that it has several offices in India, which would not on its own establish either knowledge or intent to target on the Respondent's part. Likewise, the fact that the Complainant could (hypothetically) offer its MEDITWIN branded services to Indian consumers online does not mean that the Respondent necessarily knew this and/or intended to take unfair advantage of the situation.

On the other side of the equation, as more fully discussed in the preceding section, the Respondent has satisfied the Panel that it came up with the term "MediTwin" for its digital health record project independently of the Complainant's mark, that it has a genuine business in which it is using the name descriptively even if it has no trademark rights in it, and there is no evidence on the record which would support the notion that it selected and is using the disputed domain name because of the Complainant's mark or its use whether in India or elsewhere, or that the Respondent intended to target such mark in any abusive manner.

Finally, the Complainant focuses on the Respondent's use of a privacy service as suggestive of registration and use in bad faith. This submission overlooks the fact that the use of such a service is virtually a default setting for many domain name registrars.³ Such masking of the Respondent's details in RDAP data by its

² The search returns note on their footer "Les résultats sont personnalisés" (the results are personalized) meaning that the search is non-neutral because Google is tailoring the results based on factors associated with the searcher, such as, the searcher's Google account activity and previous searches, websites previously visited, location (in addition to the IP address), language settings, and other possible signals from its systems. It should be noted that the Respondent's Google search of July 5, 2026, was similarly personalized, but in evidential terms this is less significant to the present case, in that the Panel is trying to understand from the Respondent's India-focused search what the Respondent might have seen based upon its IP address and its personalization settings when it registered the disputed domain name. Consequently, the personalization settings are more relevant, even if they post-date the registration of the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the fact that the Respondent used the word "India" in its search will have influenced the search results in the direction of that location, something that the Complainant's search does not do.

³ Indeed, the RDAP server entirely redacts the registrant data for the Complainant's own <3ds.com> domain name as is typical, suggesting that the Complainant would already be aware that such redactions and privacy settings are, today, routine.

Registrar is not unusual in the post-GDPR⁴ environment. It is of considerable significance on this topic that the Respondent's details were not concealed in the underlying registrant data, as verified by the Registrar following the filing of the Complaint. While some of the underlying data was out of date, this in no way demonstrates that the Respondent was deliberately trying to conceal its activities from the Complainant.

On the contrary, the Respondent has explained to the Panel's satisfaction the discrepancy in its address data resulting from its contact information dating back to the formation of its account with the Registrar in 2016, and has adequately explained the presence of the organization label "Universal Values", which it describes as an aspirational name that it hoped to use for a future venture. The Respondent adds that such name has never been held out as the operator of the "MediTwin" branded business, and the Panel can see that such business has, on the contrary, been clearly associated with the Respondent's company OmniThrive Technologies Private Limited. Crucially, notification of the Complaint was successfully achieved despite some discrepancies in the contact data, and there is no indication that the Respondent intentionally employed a privacy service or used false details to hide its identity from an anticipated complainant or to avoid being notified of a UDRP proceeding filed against it. Indeed, the fact that the Respondent filed the Response tends to refute an inference of bad faith on this basis. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.6.

The evidence in the case file as presented does not indicate that the Respondent's aim in registering the disputed domain name was to profit from or exploit the Complainant's trademark.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Andrew D. S. Lothian/

Andrew D. S. Lothian

Sole Panelist

Date: July 29, 2026

⁴ Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (General Data Protection Regulation), commonly abbreviated as "GDPR".