ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
BTCS Holding AG v. Paulo Laurent
Case No. D2025-4802

1. The Parties

The Complainant is BTCS Holding AG, Switzerland, represented by FMP Fuhrer Marbach & Partners, Switzerland.

The Respondent is Paulo Laurent, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <bitcoinsuisse.online> is registered with eNom, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on November 19, 2025. On November 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 19, 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 (Unknown Respondent) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 20, 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 November 20, 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 November 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 14, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 15, 2025.

The Center appointed Anna Carabelli as the sole panelist in this matter on December 18, 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

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the Complainant is a corporation incorporated under the laws of Switzerland. For over a decade it has been providing, directly and/or through its wholly owned subsidiaries, professional cryptocurrency trading services for over 45 cryptocurrencies under the BITCOIN SUISSE brand, by operating cryptocurrency investment platforms available at the domain names <bitcoinsuisse.com> and <bitcoinsuisse.ch> (that were registered on, and June 17, 2016, and on April 9, 2013, respectively). In total, the Complainant has five billion crypto assets in custody and over 200 employees in Switzerland, Liechtenstein, Denmark, and Slovakia.

The Complainant owns a number of trademarks for BITCOIN SUISSE including the following:

- Swiss trademark registration No. 710728, registered on December 12, 2017, in Classes 9, 14, 36, and 42; and
- International trademark registration No. 1440549, registered on November 6, 2018, in Classes 9 and 36.

Additionally, the Complainant owns a trademark registration for its logo:

- International trademark registration No.1450827 (figurative), registered on November 6, 2018, in Classes 9 and 36.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 28, 2025 and does not resolve to an active website. According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, at time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name linked to a web page containing a message in Bulgarian language saying “Очаквайте скоро! Този домейн е регистриран за клиент на СуперХостинг.БГ” (in English “Coming soon! This domain has been registered for a client СуперХостинг.БГ”). At the time of this Decision the disputed domain name resolves to a host page displaying the message “This account has been suspended”.

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 Complainant’s trademark BITCOIN SUISSE has been in continuous use for over a decade, and has acquired a significant goodwill and reputation;
- The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s trademark;
- The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. Passive holding does not establish legitimate interests;
- The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith; and
- The Respondent registered the disputed domain name with a privacy shield service and provided false information to conceal his identity, which constitutes further evidence of the Respondent’s bad faith. In this regard, the Complainant reports having attempted to contact the Respondent at the telephone number provided without success, as according to information provided by the telephone operator that number is not assigned.

Based on the above, the Complainant requests the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs the Panel to decide the Complaint based on the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove each of the following:

(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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out four illustrative circumstances, which for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, shall be evidence of registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy sets out three illustrative circumstances any one of which, if found by the Panel, shall be evidence of the Respondent's rights to or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy above.

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 addition of the generic Top-Level Domain, such as ".online", is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is typically 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. There is no indication before the Panel of any activity in relation to the disputed domain name that would give rise to rights or legitimate interests to the Respondent. Also, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the Panel notes the nature of the disputed domain name as discussed in paragraph A. above, which carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant.

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 according to the unrebutted evidence in the Complaint, the Complainant's BITCOIN SUISSE trademark was widely used in commerce for many years well before the registration of the disputed domain name, and has, as a result, acquired considerable reputation and goodwill. In the circumstances of the case, particularly noting the composition of the disputed domain name, it is difficult to believe that the Respondent did not have in mind the Complainant's trademark when registering the disputed domain name, consisting of the Complainant's trademark.

As to bad faith use, the disputed domain name does not point to an active website. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a "coming soon" page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. Although panelists will look at the totality of the circumstances in each case, factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, (iii) the respondent's concealing its identity or use of false contact details (noted to be in breach of its registration agreement), and (iv) the implausibility of any good faith use to which the domain name may be put. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.3.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name as discussed above, the failure of the Respondent to submit a response, the Respondent's use, for the purpose of registering the disputed domain name, of contact details that appear to be false or at least inaccurate, as well as the implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put in view of the misleading nature of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of 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 <bitcoinsuisse.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Anna Carabelli/
Anna Carabelli
Sole Panelist
Date: December 31, 2025