ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
CTC Innovations, LLC v. 小芳 陈
Case No. D2025-1996

1. The Parties

The Complainant is CTC Innovations, LLC, United States of America, represented by Neal, Gerber & Eisenberg LLP, United States of America.

The Respondent is 小芳 陈, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ctc-crypto.com> 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 May 19, 2025. On May 20, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 20, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 21, 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 27, 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 June 4, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 24, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 26, 2025.

The Center appointed Jeremy Speres as the sole panelist in this matter on July 1, 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 proprietary trading firm with offices in Chicago, New York, Boulder, and London, operating on numerous derivative exchanges globally, and offering venture capital services including in relation to cryptocurrency investments. It has traded under its CHICAGO TRADING COMPANY and CTC marks for twenty years.

The Complainant's CTC mark is registered in numerous jurisdictions, including Chinese Trademark Registration No. 26300632 CTC in class 36, having a registration date of October 14, 2019.

The Complainant's CTC mark has been recognized as being well known by prior panels under the Policy. See, for example, *CTC Innovations, LLC v. On behalf of ctcfinancialgroup.com owner, Whois Privacy Service / dsadsa dasda*, WIPO Case No. D2021-2037.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 26, 2024, and currently does not resolve to any website. The Complainant's evidence establishes that the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website offering cryptocurrency trading services under the name "CTC-CRYPTO".

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 was registered and has been used in bad faith in order to take advantage of confusion with the Complainant's reputed mark for the Respondent's commercial gain.

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 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.

Although the addition of other terms, here "-crypto", 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.

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.

For the reasons discussed in relation to bad faith below, it is likely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to take advantage of confusion with the Complainant's mark. The Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name in these circumstances cannot represent a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy and cannot confer rights or legitimate interests. *Sistema de Ensino Poliedro Vestibulares Ltda., Editora Poliedro Ltda. v. Anonymize, Inc. / STANLEY PACE*, WIPO Case No. D2022-1981.

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.

For the following reasons, the Panel finds that it is more likely than not that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name to take advantage of confusion with the Complainant's mark for the Respondent's commercial gain, falling squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar to a widely known trademark, as in this case, by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.1.4.

As discussed above, prior panels under the Policy have recognised the repute of the Complainant's mark in relation to financial services. The Complainant appears to have previously operated an office in Hong Kong, China, and traded in China – the Respondent's jurisdiction, thus the Respondent may well have encountered the Complainant in its own jurisdiction of China. The Complainant also offers financial services relating to

cryptocurrency, which is the industry in respect of which the disputed domain name has been used and the industry which is referred to by the composition of the disputed domain name itself.

The disputed domain name's erstwhile website claimed to "Provide secure reliable digital asset trading and asset management services to millions of users in more than 130 countries around the world." Despite these claims, and in accordance with its powers of independent research articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, the Panel can find no evidence online of the Respondent's cryptocurrency platform having ever been operational. It is not referred to on any third-party websites as far as the Panel can tell from cursory Internet searches, as one would expect if the platform actually did have millions of users. This suggests duplicity on the Respondent's part, which in turn points to bad faith intentions in relation to the disputed domain name.

The Panel draws an adverse inference from the Respondent's failure to take part in the present proceeding where an explanation is certainly called for. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 4.3.

The Respondent apparently supplied incomplete or false address details in the WhoIs record for the disputed domain name; the Center's courier indicated that a "bad address" was supplied, and that the Center's correspondence could not be delivered to the Respondent. In the circumstances of this case, this suggests an attempt by the Respondent to evade pursuit. *Kabushiki Kaisha Raibudoa v. Kubota, A*, WIPO Case No. D2001-0817.

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 <ctc-crypto.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jeremy Speres/
Jeremy Speres
Sole Panelist
Date: July 3, 2025