

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Anthropic, PBC v. Malik Ijaz, Trade Fast
Case No. D2025-3374

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Anthropic, PBC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Elster & McGrady LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Malik Ijaz, Trade Fast, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <claudeai.guru> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 21, 2025. On August 22, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 22, 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 / Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf,) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 25, 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 August 26, 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 August 28, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 17, 2025. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on August 28 and 29 and September 1, 5, 9, 15, and 17, 2025.

On September 3, 2025, upon the suspension request of the Complainant, the proceeding was suspended for purposes of settlement discussions. On September 3, 2025, the proceeding was reinstituted at the request of the Complainant. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties of the commencement of the Panel appointment process on September 12, 2025.

The Complainant submitted an unsolicited supplemental filing on September 12, 2025.

The Center appointed Steven A. Maier as the sole panelist in this matter on September 17, 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 public benefit corporation located in San Francisco, California, United States. It is an artificial intelligence research company and operates a large language module product named CLAUDE.

The Complainant is the owner of various registrations for the trademark CLAUDE. Those registrations include, for example:

- International trademark registration number 1745622 for the word mark CLAUDE, registered on July 10, 2023 in International Class 42; and
- United States trademark registration number 7645254 for the word mark CLAUDE, registered on January 7, 2025 (with a filing date of February 10, 2023) in International Class 42.

The Complaint operates a website at “www.claude.ai”.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 24, 2024.

The Complainant exhibits screenshots of a website at the disputed domain name on various dates in April and August 2025. The website is headed “Claude AI Guru” and contains the headers “Home”, “Blog”, “Crypto30x.com”, “Claude AI”, “Generative AI”, “AI Trends” and “Reviews”. The website appears to contain various articles about the Complainant’s CLAUDE product, as well as articles about a number of other products or websites such as Numberlina.com, Crypto30x.com and NippyBox. In addition, it displays what the Complainant says are Google Ads, including those headed “Blemished Credit?” and “Convenient Storage & Office Solutions”. The website also includes a “Disclaimer” section with various subsections relating to the website operator’s liability, although these not appear to make any reference to the operator’s relationship (or otherwise) with the Complainant.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant submits that it is a leading AI research company, having operated since at least 2001. It states that it launched its CLAUDE model in March 2023, following which it gained significant attention including a USD 4 billion investment from Amazon, and is now available in at least 175 countries.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its CLAUDE trademark, since it adopts the mark CLAUDE in its entirety, together with the industry-specific term “ai”. It adds that the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.guru” should be disregarded as a standard registration requirement.

The Complaint states that, while the disputed domain name was registered prior to the registration date of its United States trademark, the disputed domain name was registered after it had filed its application for that mark, and following extensive press coverage of the release of its CLAUDE model.¹

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. It states that it has never authorized the Respondent to use its CLAUDE trademark. It denies that the Respondent is making either bona fide commercial use or legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, and asserts that it is instead misleading Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name is somehow affiliated with the Complainant. It submits that the Respondent's "Disclaimer" is inadequate in that regard, and immaterial in any event, since Internet users will already have been wrongfully attracted to the Respondent's website, which relates to various IT services and also generates revenue via Google Ads.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It argues that it is obvious from the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name that it was aware of the Complainant's CLAUDE trademark at the date it registered the disputed domain name. It contends that the disputed domain name carries a high risk of affiliation with the Complainant's CLAUDE trademark, and that the Respondent is attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with that trademark.

The Complainant submits further that the Respondent has attempted to sell the disputed domain name to it for up to USD 20,000. It exhibits an initial email request for that amount dated April 23, 2025, to which the Complainant counter-offered to pay USD 2,000, which appeared to have been accepted by the Respondent on May 24, 2025. The Respondent then appears to have asked for USD 5,000 and subsequently USD 8,000 on May 29, 2025, stating that the latter "includes website maintenance, content writing, and employee salaries." There is also an email from the Respondent (the date of which is unclear) stating that the price will be increased every month to reflect ongoing expenses. The Complainant submits that the sums requested by the Respondent are well in excess of the usual out-of-pocket costs for the registration and maintenance of a domain name, that it is reasonable to conclude that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in order to sell it to the Complainant, and that the Respondent has sought to hold the Complainant to ransom.

The Complainant also submits that mail exchanger (MX) records have been configured on the disputed domain name, which provides the ability to use it for email fraud, and that the Respondent has used inaccurate contact details, adopting the names "Merry" and "Mark Wilson" in correspondence.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent states that his website represents only an informational blog, and that he does not use the Complainant's name, trademark or branding in any way.

The Respondent submits that he offered a fair settlement to the Complainant, representing the expenses he had personally incurred over the past two years in maintaining and developing the website. He states that the Complainant has refused even to cover these basic costs.

The Respondent argues that the Complainant has only shown an interest in the disputed domain name since his website began to generate traffic, and that the Complainant has since pressured him into handing over the disputed domain name. He asserts that the Complainant is not based on any genuine dispute, but represents instead an attempt to obtain a well-ranked domain name.

¹ The Panel also notes that the Complainant's International trademark had been registered prior to the date of registration of the disputed domain name.

6. Complainant's Unsolicited Supplemental Filing

Supplemental filings are generally discouraged in proceedings under the UDRP unless requested by the Panel, or if certain exceptional circumstances exist, e.g., the inability of a party to have foreseen an argument advanced by the opposing party.

In this case the Panel does not consider it necessary or appropriate to consider the Complainant's unsolicited supplemental filing.

7. Discussion and Findings

In order to succeed in the Complaint, the Complainant is required to show that all three of the elements set out under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are present. Those elements are that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is 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 name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has demonstrated that it is the owner of registered trademark rights in the mark CLAUDE.

The disputed domain name wholly incorporates that mark, with the addition of the term "ai", which does not prevent the Complainant's mark from being recognizable within the disputed domain name. The use of the gTLD ".guru" is immaterial to the comparison undertaken under the first element of the Policy, although it may have a bearing on considerations under the second and third elements.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Respondent claims that he uses the disputed domain name for the purpose of an informational blog, which does not take unfair advantage of the Complainant's trademark rights.

As stated in paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy, a respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in respect of a disputed domain name "if you are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue."

For a number of reasons, the Panel does not find that the present case meets the criteria set out above.

First, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name itself is inherently misleading in nature. It comprises the Complainant's trademark CLAUDE and the term "ai", which describes the Complainant's business, and also reflects the Complainant's own website location at "www.claude.ai". Furthermore, the gTLD ".guru" (which implies instruction or guidance) does not make clear that the site is operated by a party independent of the Complainant, as opposed to being an official or authorized site, and is at best ambiguous in that regard.

Secondly, while the Respondent's website does contain articles relating to the Complainant's CLAUDE product, it also appears to include articles relating to other IT and cryptocurrency products or services seemingly unconnected with the Complainant. In the view of the Panel, this constitutes an unfair use of the

Complainant's trademark in connection with an informational website, just as it would if used for a commercial reseller or similar site (see e.g. section 2.8.1. of WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"). The Panel also notes the "Disclaimer" section contained on the Respondent's website does not appear to make clear its lack of affiliation with the Complainant or its CLAUDE product.

Thirdly, the Complainant submits, and the Respondent does not appear to deny, that the Respondent derives advertising revenue from adverts or links included on the relevant website. This factor prevents the Respondent's website from being noncommercial in nature, and adds to an overall impression of unfairly targeting the Complainant's trademark for commercial gain.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

For similar reasons as set out above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name is inherently misleading, as strongly implying an affiliation with the Complainant and its official website. Further, the Respondent's website includes materials relating to products or services from businesses other than the Complainant, and the Respondent appears to obtain commercial benefit by way of advertising revenue from the website. The Panel therefore rejects the Respondent's assertion that his website does not take unfair advantage of the Complainant's trademark rights.

The Panel finds also that the prices requested by the Respondent for the disputed domain name, linked to the manner of his negotiations as described above, are also indicative of bad-faith intent. Figures of USD 20,000 or even USD 8,000 are unlikely to represent the Respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name: the Respondent's claimed costs of website development do not appear to the Panel to be relevant, as the Complainant has sought only to purchase the disputed domain name and not the Respondent's website or content, which could presumably be moved to another location.

The Panel concludes in the circumstances that, by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or of a product or service on its website (paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy). Further or alternatively, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling it to the Complainant for valuable consideration in excess of his documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name (paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy).

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

8. 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 <claudeai.guru> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Steven A. Maier/

Steven A. Maier

Sole Panelist

Date: October 1, 2025