

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

DeepJudge AG v. Joaquim Ribeiro

Case No. D2025-1803

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is DeepJudge AG, Switzerland, represented by Nicoletta Iurilli, Attorney at Law Switzerland.

The Respondent is Joaquim Ribeiro, Portugal.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <deepjudge.net> is registered with Nicenic International Group Co., Limited (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 6, 2025. On May 6, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 7, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 13, 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 May 13, 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 May 14, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 3, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 4, 2025.

The Center appointed Lynda J. Zadra-Symes as the sole panelist in this matter on June 18, 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 a Swiss legal tech startup specializing in AI-powered tools for legal document processing and enterprise search. Its platform aims to enhance efficiency for legal professionals.

The Complainant owns Swiss trademark registration No. 759469 for DEEPJUDGE with a figurative element, which was filed on October 5, 2020, and registered on February 17, 2021.

The Complainant operates its services via <deepjudge.ai> and <deepjudge.ch>. These domain names were registered on June 10, 2023, and May 10, 2024, respectively.

The disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent on October 20, 2024. The Complainant first detected the disputed domain name being used on October 31, 2024.

In March 2025, the Respondent impersonated the Complainant's account on the social media platform X and linked it to the disputed domain name. This illegal profile was promptly reported by the Complainant and taken down by X Support.

The website located at the disputed domain name mirrors the design and content of the old version of the Complainant's official website at "www.deepjudge.ai".

#### **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 contends that the disputed domain name incorporates the word portion of the Complainant's registered trademark in its entirety, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and that the domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

##### **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.

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 Complainant's mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. The presence of a figurative element in the Complainant's trademark does not affect the assessment of confusing similarity. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7, and 1.10.

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.

There is no evidence in the record that the Respondent has used or made preparations to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and the content of the Respondent's website which copies content from the Complainant's old website cannot constitute a bona fide non-commercial or fair use.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, claimed here as impersonation of the Complainant, or passing off, phishing or other types of fraud, 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 been actively using the disputed domain name by hosting a website that mirrors the design and content of the old version of the Complainant's website at "www.deepjudge.ai". The only accessible page from the Respondent's website at the disputed domain name is the homepage. This limited functionality reinforces the Respondent's intent of fraudulent activity and phishing and suggests that the Respondent's primary goal is to deceive users rather than provide any legitimate content or services.

In addition, the Respondent impersonated the Complainant's account on the social media platform X, and linked it to the disputed domain name. The profile was created in March 2023, promptly reported by the Complainant and taken down.

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 as claimed here, impersonating the Complainant, passing off and phishing or other types of fraud, 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 <deepjudge.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Lynda J. Zadra-Symes/*  
**Lynda J. Zadra-Symes**  
Sole Panelist  
Date: July 2, 2025