

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Care Coordination Systems LLC, The Regents of the University of Colorado
v. Andreas Andreou
Case No. D2025-4193

1. The Parties

Complainants are Care Coordination Systems LLC (“Complainant No.1”) and The Regents of the University of Colorado (“Complainant No. 2”), United States of America (“United States”), represented by Brennan, Manna & Diamond, LLC, United States.

Respondent is Andreas Andreou, Cyprus, represented by Marks and Clerk LLP, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <caretransitions.org> is registered with OwnRegistrar, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 13, 2025. On October 14, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 14, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on October 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 13, 2025. As requested by Respondent, the due date for Response was extended to November 17, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on November 17, 2025.

The Center appointed Stephanie G. Hartung as the sole panelist in this matter on November 27, 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

Complainant No. 1 is a company organized under the laws of the United States that is active in the healthcare industry, while Complainant No. 2 is a corporate body as well organized under the laws of the United States that functions as the governing board of the University of Colorado, United States.

Complainants have demonstrated to be the purchaser/assignee (Complainant No. 1) and the seller/assignor (Complainant No. 2), respectively, of the following registered trademark:

- word trademark CARE TRANSITIONS INTERVENTION, United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), registration number: 3996838, registration date: July 19, 2011, status: active.

Moreover, Complainants have demonstrated that Complainant No. 2 was the former owner of the disputed domain name and intended to transfer it at some future point to Complainant No. 1 after conclusion of a purchase and sale agreement of 2019 and a trademark assignment agreement of 2020 in relation to the aforementioned trademark. Sometime between 2019 and April 2025, Complainants discovered that Complainant No. 2 was no longer in possession of the disputed domain name, apparently due to a technical failure in the transfer process between Complainants.

Respondent is a resident of Cyprus who registered the disputed domain name at some point after Complainant No. 2's ownership unintentionally ended. The disputed domain name resolves to a website at "www.caretransitions.org" which offers a platform for online casino services headed "Best USDT Casinos".

Complainants request that the disputed domain name be transferred to them.

Respondent requests that the Complaint be denied and that the Panel finds for a case of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Complainants submit that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainants' CARE TRANSITIONS INTERVENTION trademark, as a dominant feature thereof is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Moreover, Complainants assert that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since (1) Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and (2) Respondent is making an invalid and unfair use of the disputed domain name, with apparent intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers and/or to tarnish the trademark at issue. Finally, Complainants argue that Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith since (1) the current website homepage is directed to "Best USDT Casinos" with a headline entitled "9+ Best USDT Casinos to Play in 2025: Top Trusted Tether Sites", which is clearly an attempt by Respondent to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainants' CARE TRANSITIONS INTERVENTION trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent's website or of a product or service on Respondent's website, and (2) Respondent may have acquired the disputed domain name primarily for the

purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring it to the owner of the trademark (Complainants) or to a competitor of Complainants, for valuable consideration in excess of Respondent's out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

Respondent contends that Complainants have not satisfied all three of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Respondent denies that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to Complainants' CARE TRANSITIONS INTERVENTION trademark, since (1) the term "intervention" is the longest word in such trademark and its absence would not go unnoticed in a side-by-side comparison with the disputed domain name, especially considering the descriptiveness of the terms contained therein, and (2) the term "care" in Complainants' CARE TRANSITIONS INTERVENTION trademark has been disclaimed. Moreover, Respondent submits that it has rights and legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since (1) Complainants have failed to demonstrate that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, (2) the latter consists of a generic term "caretransitions" that is commonly used in relation to the movement of people from one care setting to another, (3) Complainants' CARE TRANSITIONS INTERVENTION trademark contains the additional element "intervention" that is missing from the disputed domain name, (4) the fact that Complainant No. 2 at one point in time owned the disputed domain name is insufficient to conclude that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect thereof, (5) Respondent was not aware of Complainants and their CARE TRANSITIONS INTERVENTION trademark at the time of acquiring the disputed domain name, and (6) Respondent's business of buying and selling domain names is legitimate as those domain names are not bought for their brand value and not for the purpose of targeting a particular party. Finally, Respondent asserts that it has neither registered nor is it using the disputed domain name in bad faith since (1) the disputed domain name only contains the common descriptive words "care transitions" to which Complainants cannot claim monopoly rights, (2) Complainants do not have a reputation in the words "care transitions" and it would be unreasonable to find bad faith here unless Complainants were able to demonstrate such significant reputation, (3) the descriptive nature of the words "care transitions" means it is entirely reasonable for Respondent not to have been familiar with Complainants at the time of registering/acquiring the disputed domain name, (4) Complainants and Respondent are not competitors, (5) the disputed domain name was purchased in good faith from a third party seller who had acquired it at a GoDaddy auction and Respondent uses a defined process to identify domain names that it wishes to acquire without any motivation to purchase domain names that infringe third-party trademarks, and (6) Respondent is using the disputed domain name in relation to content that does not in any way suggest a connection with Complainants.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, Complainants carry the burden of proving:

- (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainants have rights; and
- (ii) that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Consolidation due to multitude of Complainants

First, the Panel notes that Complainants are in a contractual relationship based on a purchase and sale agreement of 2019 and a trademark assignment agreement of 2020 between them concerning, inter alia, the disputed domain name and, thus, have a specific common grievance against Respondent why it is appropriate in the case at hand and in line with the UDRP panelists' majority view to accept this Complaint filed by multiple Complainants (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.11.1).

B. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Second, 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 Complainants' CARE TRANSITIONS INTERVENTION trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Complainants have shown rights in respect of their CARE TRANSITIONS INTERVENTION trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. Also, the disputed domain name exactly matches the first and second word elements of which Complainants' trademark is composed, so that the latter is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainants' CARE TRANSITIONS INTERVENTION trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. The fact that the term "care" in Complainants' CARE TRANSITIONS INTERVENTION trademark has been disclaimed is not against such finding; only in exceptional cases where a trademark registration entirely disclaims the textual elements (e.g. the scope of protection afforded to a trademark is effectively limited to its stylized elements), panels may find that Complainant's trademark registration is insufficient by itself to support standing under the UDRP which, however, does not apply in the case at hand. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.10.

The Panel, therefore, finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

C. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Third, paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which 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.

The Panel's assessment of the facts brought before it in relation to the second element of the Policy starts from the outset that the disputed domain name is composed of two dictionary words "care" and "transitions", which exactly match two out of three word elements contained in Complainants' CARE TRANSITIONS INTERVENTION trademark, allowing to find that the disputed domain name and such trademark are confusingly similar as set forth by paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. While Respondent, in particular, points to the dictionary meaning behind the disputed domain name, UDRP panels recognize that merely registering a domain name comprised of a dictionary word or phrase does not by itself automatically confer rights or legitimate interests on the respondent; rather, the domain name should be genuinely used, or at least demonstrably intended for such use, in connection with the relied upon dictionary meaning and not to trade off third-party trademark rights. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.10. Here, the Panel notes that Respondent uses the disputed domain name to operate a website at "www.caretransitions.org" which offers a platform for online casino services headed "Best USDT Casinos". This Internet presence obviously has nothing to do with the dictionary meaning of the words "care" and "transition" which – according to Respondent's own contentions – are commonly used in relation to the movement of people from one care setting to another. Also, Respondent has brought not a single argument forward as to why it needed to rely exactly on the disputed domain name in order to operate a website offering online casino services. At the same time, this Panel has well noted that Respondent is in the business of buying and selling domain names and so acquired the disputed domain name, allegedly for its dictionary or descriptive meaning and without having been familiar with Complainants and their CARE TRANSITIONS INTERVENTION trademark at the time of

registering/acquiring the disputed domain name. Complainants, in turn, have failed to sufficiently demonstrate that such trademark enjoys any relevant reputation, whether globally or at least territorially, as to cast reasonable doubts on Respondent's contentions in that respect.

Therefore, in view of the existence of various arguments for and against the finding of Respondent's rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, the Panel has decided to leave this finding under Section C. open, as it is irrelevant in light of the finding in Section D below.

D. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Fourth, 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 this context, it must be reiterated that the burden of proof for a finding of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith is on Complainants alone. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.

In this context, it plays a decisive role that Complainants did not bring forward sufficient arguments and supportive evidence which would have allowed this Panel to conclude that their CARE TRANSITIONS INTERVENTION trademark enjoys any relevant reputation, whether globally or at least territorially, which Respondent was or should have been aware of by the time of registering and using the disputed domain name. This is particularly important in view of the fact that the disputed domain name is composed of two dictionary terms which, in turn, opens up scope for various lawful purposes of use to which the disputed domain name can be put, and which do not target Complainants' specific trademark rights. Also, the Panel recognizes that Respondent has never attempted to approach Complainants with an offer to sell the disputed domain name which formerly belonged to Complainant No. 2 and never attempted to offer any content thereunder which is in direct or indirect competition with Complainants' own business whatsoever. Finally, the fact that the disputed domain name does not contain the term "intervention" as it forms part of Complainants' CARE TRANSITIONS INTERVENTION trademark does not necessarily amount to any kind of intentional misspelling, which might have supported a finding of bad faith on the part of Respondent; rather, the latter registered the disputed domain name as it was formerly owned and used by Complainants themselves and lapsed unintentionally, apparently due a technical mistake.

The Panel, therefore, finds Complainants have not shown that Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, and so have failed to establish the third element of the Policy.

E. Reverse Domain Name Hijacking (RDNH)

Fifth, the Panel has considered whether it would be appropriate as per Respondent's request to make a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking (RDNH) against Complainants. Under paragraph 15(e) of the Rules, a panel is obliged to state in its decision any conclusion it might reach that complainant has brought the complaint in bad faith (for example in an attempt of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking), or primarily to harass the domain name holder. The Rules define "Reverse Domain Name Hijacking" as "using the Policy in bad faith to attempt to deprive a registered domain-name holder of a domain name".

Thereafter, the Panel is not persuaded that the circumstances of this case justify the finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking. Apparently, there is no evidence whatsoever that Complainant was ill motivated in lodging the Complaint. Moreover, in fact it remains unanswered as to why Respondent ever registered the disputed domain name which apparently has no meaning whatsoever that relates to an online casino business as it is operated thereunder. Accordingly, this case obviously was not at all hopeless and was not deprived of being brought before a UDRP panel for a decision.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

Respondent's request to find for a Reverse Domain Name Hijacking (RDNH), however, is rejected, as the Complaint was not brought in bad faith.

/Stephanie G. Hartung/

Stephanie G. Hartung

Sole Panelist

Date: December 4, 2025