

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

La Maison de la Science AG v. Mr. Mitul Gajera
Case No. D2025-1301

1. The Parties

The Complainant is La Maison de la Science AG, Switzerland, represented by PRINS Intellectual Property AG, Switzerland.

The Respondent is Mr. Mitul Gajera, India, represented by VIDHAN SE NIDAN LAW OFFICES LLP, India.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <labyrinthprotocol.com>, <labyrinthprotocol.tech>, <labyrinthprotocol.xyz>, <labyrinth.technology>, and <zkfi.tech> are registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 28, 2025. On March 31, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On March 31, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the 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 April 1, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 21, 2025. Pursuant to the Respondent’s request for a further extension to file a Response and taking into account the stated reasons for that request, the Center in accordance with paragraph 5(e) of the Rules granted a further extension of the Response due date until May 5, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on May 5, 2025.

The Center appointed Evan D. Brown as the sole panelist in this matter on May 9, 2025. 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 in the business of developing privacy-focused blockchain technology. It owns the trademarks LABYRINTH (Swiss Trademark No. 828052, registered on March 17, 2025) and ZKFI (Swiss Trademark No. 828051, registered on March 17, 2025).

The disputed domain names were registered as follows:

- <labyrinth.technology> on May 6, 2024
- <labyrinthprotocol.xyz>, <labyrinthprotocol.tech>, and <labyrinthprotocol.com> on June 14, 2024
- <zkfi.tech> on June 1, 2023

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is a former employee and shareholder who registered these disputed domain names while under contract with the Complainant, using the Complainant's resources but procuring the disputed domain names in his own name – apparently contrary to contractual obligations. The Respondent has refused to transfer the disputed domain names following termination of his contract.

The disputed domain names are for some redirecting to a website displaying a warning message stating “our company is facing a serious legal dispute involving a fraudulent takeover attempt”, for others displaying an error message or displaying Pay-Per-Click links.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contests each of the Complainant's arguments under all three elements of the Policy.

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights, (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names, and (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith. The Panel finds that the Complainant has not satisfied the third element.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has demonstrated its rights in the LABYRINTH and ZKFI marks by providing evidence of its trademark registrations. The disputed domain names incorporate either the LABYRINTH or ZKFI mark in its entirety. The addition of terms such as “protocol” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the first element under the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel does not address this element in light of the finding under the third element.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The critical issue in this case is timing. The disputed domain names were registered before the Complainant acquired its trademark rights. The Complainant's trademarks were registered on March 17, 2025. All the disputed domain names were registered before this date — the earliest on June 1, 2023, and the latest on June 14, 2024.

Under section 3.8.1 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), when a domain name is registered before the complainant's trademark rights accrue, panels generally do not find bad faith registration. The record in this case does not support a finding that the case falls within the type of exception set out in section 3.8.2 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), which allows for a finding of bad faith if the respondent registers a domain name in anticipation of trademark rights due to insider knowledge. Instead, this appears to be a business dispute more suitable for resolution in a tribunal that can make more detailed findings, to sort through the various issues that appear to exist between the parties.

While the Complainant alleges that the Respondent was a contractor with access to proprietary information, the disputed domain names were registered significantly before the Complainant's trademarks were filed or registered. The Complainant has not shown that it had enforceable unregistered trademark rights at the time of registration of the disputed domain names, nor has it established that the Respondent's actions were designed to unfairly capitalize on nascent rights.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has not met its burden of proving that the disputed domain names were registered in bad faith.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Evan D. Brown/

Evan D. Brown

Sole Panelist

Date: May 23, 2025