ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

# ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Anthropic, PBC v. Chuanhu Yang, Genius Path Inc
Case No. D2025-3505

## 1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Chuanhu Yang, Genius Path Inc, China.

## 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <claudemcp.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

## 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 28, 2025. On August 29, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 4, 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 / Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 4, 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 September 9, 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 September 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 30, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 3, 2025.

The Center appointed Theda König Horowicz as the sole panelist in this matter on October 31, 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 United States corporation. It is active in the artificial intelligence business and has developed a family of large language models ("LLMs") which it markets and promotes using the mark CLAUDE. The first Claude model was launched in March 2023 and the most recent, Claude 4, was released on May 22, 2025. The Claude model family is available in most countries worldwide and swiftly garnered significant attention including from Amazon which invested $4 billion in the Anthropic company in 2023. The Claude model was extensively commented on in specialized tech press publications in 2024.

The Complainant also developed an open-source protocol called the Model Context Protocol (MCP) which is a product promoted by the Complainant on its websites.

The Complainant owns inter alia the United States trademark CLAUDE Reg. No. 7645254, registered on January 7, 2025. The registration certificate indicates that the trademark was first used in commerce on March 14, 2023.

The Complainant provides access to its Claude model under the official website "claude.ai". The domain name "claude.ai" was registered on August 4, 2018.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 27, 2024. At the time of the filing of the complaint, it resolved to a website which directs consumers to a website featuring services related to Complainant's Claude AI model and MCP product.

## 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 its CLAUDE trademark. In particular, the Complainant mentions that the CLAUDE trademark is entirely contained in the disputed domain name and that the addition "mcp" which stands for "Model Context Protocol" is not sufficient to differentiate the disputed domain name from the trademark. "Model Context Protocol" is used by the Complainant as a brand and a US application is pending for this designation. The Complainant invokes not only its US trademark registration which was registered after the disputed domain name but also a Chinese trademark registration of January 21, 2024. The Complainant alleges to have common law rights in the CLAUDE mark as of 2023, prior to the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further invokes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the term "claude". The Respondent has never operated a bona fide or legitimate business under the disputed domain name since he uses the website to direct consumers to a website featuring services related to Complainant's CLAUDE AI model and MCP product thus creating an impression of affiliation with the Complaint. Furthermore, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to display Google Ads which generate revenue. The Complainant did not grant the Respondent a license, permission or authorization to use the CLAUDE trademark and the Respondent is not known by the CLAUDE mark or any variation thereof.

Finally, the Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The arguments invoked by the Complainant are basically the same as for the second criteria, such as the intention of the Respondent to attract internet users for commercial gain and the use of the Complainant's CLAUDE trademark as well as designations such as "Anthropic" and "Claude MCP". Additionally, the Complainant underlines that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to trade off the reputation and goodwill of the CLAUDE mark and to disrupt the Complainant's business, referring notably to the composition of the disputed domain name which includes both "claude" and "mcp" that is terms of Complainant's products. The use of a privacy service to register the disputed domain name is another indication of 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 the CLAUDE trademark 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, "mcp" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy, particularly since "mcp" is a designation used by the Complainant for a specific product named the Model Context Protocol also known as MCP. 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 Panel considers that the composition of the disputed domain name, consisting of the entirety of the Complainant's CLAUDE brand and the term "mcp" which directly relates to the Complainant's Model Context Protocol also known as MCP carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.5.1. Panels have also 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 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.

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 disputed domain name was registered on November 27, 2024, that is before the US trademark registration was obtained by the Complainant for CLAUDE on January 7, 2025. Besides the said US trademark registration, the Complainant invokes prior common law rights in CLAUDE and refers to other prior trademark registrations it would own, in particular a Chinese trademark registration of January 21, 2024, but the case file does not contain sufficient evidence in this regard.

However, the Panel notes that the Complainant has given sufficient evidence to show that its CLAUDE trademark and model was used and visible on the internet prior to the registration of the disputed domain name on November 27, 2024:

- The Complainant's domain name "claude.ai" was registered in 2018.

- Its US CLAUDE trademark was filed on February 10, 2023, and a first used in commerce is indicated as of March 14, 2023, in the registration.

- CLAUDE was extensively used and promoted by the Complainant and got significant media attention, particularly in specialized tech media as of early 2024, shortly after Amazon's large investment in Complainant's business was announced.

- The disputed domain name contains two designations used as a brand by the Complainant: CLAUDE and "mcp" for Model Context Protocol ; this clearly shows that the Respondent was targeting the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name.

Given the circumstances, the Panel estimates that the Respondent obviously knew of the CLAUDE trademark when registering the disputed domain name before the complainant's trademark rights accrue and acted in anticipation in order to unfairly capitalize on the Complainant's not yet registered US trademark right (WIPO Overview 3.0., sections 3.8.1. and 3.8.2.).

The Panel thus finds that the Respondent has acted in bad faith.

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 for example held that the use of a domain name for impersonation/passing off as it is presently the case constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.4.

The fact that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name using a privacy service and remained silent in these proceedings are additional factors of bad faith.

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 <claudemcp.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Theda König Horowicz/*
**Theda König Horowicz**
Sole Panelist
Date: November 4, 2025