

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

CTC Innovations, LLC v. Daniel Tellez-Bortoni
Case No. D2025-4336

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Daniel Tellez-Bortoni, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ctcemployment.com> is registered with Wix.com Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 22, 2025. On October 23, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 28, 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 (Wix.com Ltd.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on the same day, 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 October 31, 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 November 6, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the original due date for Response was November 26, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. The Complainant requested suspension of the proceeding for settlement discussions and the proceeding was suspended on November 19, 2025, and was extended twice until February 19, 2026, as per the Complainant’s request. On February 23, 2026, the proceeding was reinstated, and the new Response due date was March 4, 2026. The Center commenced its panel appointment process on March 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Evan D. Brown as the sole panelist in this matter on March 16, 2026. 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 in the business of providing analytical and trading services. It owns the trademark CTC, for which it enjoys the benefits of registration (e.g., United States Reg. No. 4040810, registered on October 18, 2011).

According to the Whois information, the disputed domain name was registered on July 28, 2025. The disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website. The Complainant asserts that it is highly likely an unsuspecting consumer or job applicant would believe that an email from an account using the disputed domain name is associated with the Complainant.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is virtually identical and confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not respond to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (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

This first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7. The standing test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. This element requires the Panel to consider two issues: first, whether the Complainant has rights in a relevant mark; and second, whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to that mark.

A registered trademark provides a clear indication that the rights in the mark shown on the trademark certificate belong to its respective owner. See *Advance Magazine Publishers Inc., Les Publications Conde Nast S.A. v. Voguechen*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-0657](#). The Complainant has demonstrated its rights in the CTC mark by providing evidence of its trademark registrations. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name incorporates the CTC mark in its entirety with the term "employment", which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's CTC mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. The CTC mark remains recognizable for a showing of confusing similarity under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established this first element under the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel evaluates this element of the Policy by first looking to see whether the Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. If the Complainant makes that showing, the burden of production shifts to the Respondent. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

On this point, the Complainant asserts, among other things, that: (1) the Complainant has never consented to the registration of the disputed domain name by the Respondent, (2) the Respondent has no legal relationship with the Complainant through which the Respondent can claim any rights to the disputed domain name, (3) the Respondent does not own, or have license to use, any trademarks for the term CTC, and (4) the Respondent has not made, nor is it making, a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Instead, the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to passively hold it.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has made the required prima facie showing. The Respondent has not presented evidence to overcome this prima facie showing. And nothing in the record otherwise tilts the balance in the Respondent's favor.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established this second element under the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that the Complainant has demonstrated that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith under the Policy. There is no reliable indication of any good-faith purpose for the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name and the circumstances as a whole support an inference that the Respondent targeted the Complainant or its mark.

The Complainant argues that it is implausible that the Respondent innocently registered the disputed domain name without a design to exploit its similarity to the Complainant's mark and trade name. Similarly, the Complainant asserts that by virtue of the Complainant's trademark registrations for the CTC mark, the Respondent had constructive knowledge of the Complainant's long-standing rights in the mark when the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. While the Panel takes note that the term CTC is not exclusively associated with the Complainant and that third parties also hold registrations for marks comprised of the term CTC, this does not by itself preclude a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this case.

The Complainant also argues that the passive holding of the disputed domain name in these circumstances evidences bad faith. Panels have recognized that passive holding may support a finding of bad faith depending on the totality of the circumstances, including the distinctiveness of the complainant's mark and the implausibility of any good faith use, see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3; *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#). The Panel finds that applicable circumstances are present here. In particular, the Respondent has failed to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use of the disputed domain name. Moreover, there is no evidence in the record that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or that the disputed domain name corresponds to the Respondent's name or any legitimate business or activity. In these circumstances, and taking into account the composition of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the record shows no plausible good-faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put.

Moreover, while the Respondent's use of a privacy or proxy service does not by itself establish bad faith, in the absence of any credible explanation for the registration and use of the disputed domain name, such use can, and in this case does, support a finding of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.6.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element under 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 <ctcemployment.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Evan D. Brown/

Evan D. Brown

Sole Panelist

Date: April 1, 2026