

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Helsing Germany GmbH v. Grzegorz Kapusta  
Case No. D2025-2894

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Helsing Germany GmbH, Germany, represented by Maucher Jenkins, Germany.

The Respondent is Grzegorz Kapusta, Poland.

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

The disputed domain name <helsing.biz> is registered with Key-Systems GmbH (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 22, 2025. On July 22, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 24, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 24, 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 amendment to the Complaint on July 25, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 July 28, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 17, 2025. On July 24, 2025, the Center received an email communication from an email address that, according to the Registrar verification, corresponded to the administrative/technical/billing contact of the disputed domain name. The Center informed the Parties that it would proceed with Panel Appointment on August 19, 2025.

The Center appointed Enrique Bardales Mendoza as the sole panelist in this matter on August 22, 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 German-based software and defence technology company, headquartered in Munich since its formation on December 7, 2016. It has raised significant capital, which makes the Complainant one of the most expensive military start-ups in Europe and one of the most valuable young companies in Europe overall. It is seen as the “European AI Unicorn”, placing it in a very rare position. It is highly known and well-noticed, not only within expert circles, but also to the larger public. The Complainant has been mentioned in international media outlets such as Forbes (United States of America), Bloomberg (United States of America), CNBC (United States of America), Le Monde (France) and Bild Zeitung (Germany).

The Complainant employs approximately 400 staff and continues rapid expansion. Through its substantial business activities and significant investment in promoting the “Helsing” brands, the Complainant has acquired a considerable reputation and goodwill in the field of AI-powered defence and security solutions internationally.

Since its founding, the Complainant has invested heavily in advertising and marketing its cutting-edge technologies and autonomous systems under the Helsing name and related marks. For several years, the Complainant has actively promoted its products and services on its official website, “www.helsing.ai”, ensuring strong online visibility and accessibility to potential clients worldwide.

The Complainant is the owner of multiple registrations for HELSING trademark including the following ones:

- European Union Trademark No 018439848 for HELSING (registered on October 27, 2021) and covering goods and services in classes 7, 9, 12, 13, 37, 38, 42 and 45.
- International Trademark No 1657098 for HELSING (registered on September 22, 2021) and covering goods and services in classes 7, 9, 12, 13, 37, 38, 42 and 45.
- European Union Trademark No 018594068 for HELSING (registered on April 12, 2022) and covering goods and services in classes 7, 9, 12, 13, 37, 38, 42 and 45.
- International Trademark No 1688037 for HELSING (registered on February 28, 2022) and covering goods and services in classes 7, 9, 12, 13, 37, 38, 42 and 45.

Also, the Complainant is the registrant of the domain name <helsing.ai>, registered on September 2, 2020.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 9, 2024, and currently resolves to an unsafe page hosted on a suspended server. The disputed domain name previously resolved to a website copying the Complainant’s website’s content and layout.

#### **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 HELSING trademark, and the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.biz” to the Complainant’s trademark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. Also, the Complainant states that the disputed domain name is registered and is being used in bad faith. Having in mind that the Complainant’s trademark is widely known, the registration and use of the disputed domain name creates a presumption of bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions, however on July 24, 2025, the Center received an email communication from an email address that, according to the Registrar verification, corresponded to the administrative/technical/billing contact of the disputed domain name, indicating that the disputed domain name has been suspended.

## **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 identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The applicable gTLD (here, “.biz”) 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 illegitimate activity (here, claimed 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 intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. Since the Complainant's trademark is widely known, considering also the use and nature of the disputed domain name, the Respondent must have had knowledge of the trademark before registering the disputed domain name.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed 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 <helsing.biz> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Enrique Bardales Mendoza/*

**Enrique Bardales Mendoza**

Sole Panelist

Date: September 5, 2025