

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Anthropic, PBC v. Usui Teruko/Qing Xingxing
Case No. D2025-5351

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Usui Teruko, Japan/Qing Xingxing, China.¹

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <claudegirl.com> and <cyberclaude.com> are registered with CloudFlare, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 19, 2025. On December 22, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On December 22, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Data Redacted/Qing Xingxing) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 26, 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 December 30, 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”).

¹The Panel notes the Registrar confirmed the current registrant of the disputed domain names as “Usui Teruko”, however, prior confirmed registrant details identified the registrant as “Qing Xingxing”, who submitted a Response in the present proceeding. For the purpose of this proceeding, the Panel considers both Usui Teruko and Qing Xingxing to be the Respondent.

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 30, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on January 27, 2026.

The Center appointed Kaya Köklü as the sole panelist in this matter on January 29, 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.

On February 3, 2026, the Complainant filed a supplemental filing in response to the Respondent's Response of January 27, 2026.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant, a Public Benefit Company organized under the laws of the State of Delaware, is an Artificial Intelligence ("AI") safety and research company, active in the field of building AI systems.

The Complainant owns various CLAUDE trademark registrations. Among others, the Complainant is the registered owner of the United States Trademark Registration No. 7,645,254, filed on February 10, 2023 and registered on January 7, 2025, for CLAUDE, indicating first use in commerce on March 14, 2023 and covering protection particularly for various software and AI services in class 42, and of the International Trademark Registration No. 1745622, registered on July 10, 2023, for CLAUDE, covering protection for various software and AI services in class 42, designating various jurisdictions around the globe, including Japan.

The Complainant further operates a website at "www.claude.ai".

The Respondent is reportedly located in Japan. Previously, the disputed domain names were registered in the name of a person named Qing Xingxing, who also submitted the Response in the present proceeding on January 27, 2026.

The disputed domain name <claudegirl.com> was created on August 7, 2023.

The disputed domain name <cyberclaude.com> was created on August 17, 2023.

Both disputed domain names resolved to a virtually identical website purportedly offering a "Unified LLM API Gateway" for various AI systems, including the Complainant's AI system. On the websites associated with the disputed domain names, the Complainant's figurative logo was prominently displayed without any visible disclaimer disclosing the (lack of) relationship between the Parties.

At the date of the Decision, the disputed domain names no longer resolve to an active website.

Prior to the initiation of the present proceeding, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent, which remained unanswered but was followed by a change in the Respondent's contact information.

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 names.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied all three of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names.

The Respondent asserts that it selected the name “Claude” primarily for its “generic appeal as a human name, intending to create a friendly, personified designation for a personal AI project”.

With respect to the Complainant’s contentions, the Respondent argues that the Complainant cannot monopolize any use of the term CLAUDE. The Respondent further submits that the additions “girl” and “cyber” serve to distinguish the disputed domain names from the CLAUDE mark.

The Respondent additionally argues that it is making a bona fide use of the disputed domain names, asserting in particular that the use of the Complainant’s CLAUDE trademark was only for referential purposes.

In addition, the Respondent asserts that it has not registered and is not using the disputed domain names in bad faith. It particularly argues that at the time of registration, the Complainant’s CLAUDE system was not yet known on a global level.

With respect to bad faith use, the Respondent states that it had no malicious intent, including no intent to engage in phishing or similar activities. Quite the opposite, the Respondent believes that its prompt action to disconnect the disputed domain names from active websites underscores its good faith.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Consideration of Supplement Filing by the Complainant

The Panel notes that the Center received a supplemental filing from the Complainant on February 3, 2026.

The Panel follows the reasoning of the panel in *Viz Communications, Inc. v. Redsun dba www.animerica.com and David Penava*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0905](#), that it is appropriate to consider the circumstances of each case before deciding whether or not to admit additional or late-filed submissions.

In this case, the supplemental filing by the Complainant consists, in essence, of a response to arguments raised by the Respondent, rather than the introduction of new facts or exceptional circumstances warranting their admission.

Accordingly, and in light of the general principle that parties should refrain from submitting supplemental filings within the streamlined nature of UDRP proceedings absent exceptional circumstances, the Panel is not convinced that the circumstances of this case justify a departure from this general principle and, hence, declines to admit the Complainant’s supplemental filing of February 3, 2026. In any event, the Panel notes the supplemental filing would not have altered the outcome of this proceeding.

6.2. Substantive Issues

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the three following elements is satisfied:

- (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights; and

- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

The Panel has taken note of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) and, where appropriate, will decide consistently with the consensus views captured therein.

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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the CLAUDE trademark for the purposes of the Policy, at least since its first use in commerce in March 2023 and, in any event, since the registration of its International Trademark Registration in July 2023. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names, as both disputed domain names fully comprise the CLAUDE mark in its entirety. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the CLAUDE mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here "girl" and respectively "cyber", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the CLAUDE mark for the purposes of the Policy. [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 names.

The Respondent has not come forward with any convincing evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise. Particularly, the Panel notes that the Respondent has not provided a convincing explanation as to why it chose to incorporate the Complainant's CLAUDE mark into the disputed domain names. Furthermore, in view of the Panel, the CLAUDE trademark, in relation to AI services, is neither descriptive nor otherwise required to be kept available for use by third parties.

The Respondent's allegation that the trademark CLAUDE has been used for referential purposes only, is in view of the Panel not convincing, particularly as the Respondent cannot be assessed as a legitimate service provider in light of the principles set forth in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#) ("*Oki Data*") and thus is not entitled to use the Complainant's CLAUDE trademark within the disputed domain names accordingly. The criteria as set forth in *Oki Data* are apparently not fulfilled in the present case. The Panel particularly notes that under the disputed domain names the Respondent offers not only AI services for the AI system of the Complainant but also for competing third-party AI systems of other commercial origin. Additionally, the websites linked to disputed domain names use the Complainant's logo and do not accurately and prominently disclose the relationship, or rather the lack thereof, between the Respondent and the Complainant, thus creating the false impression that the Respondent might be an authorized service provider for the Complainant's AI system. In view of the Panel, all this takes the Respondent out of the *Oki Data* safe harbour for purposes of the second element.

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.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain names and deliberately sought to capitalize on the reputation of the CLAUDE mark for its own commercial gain. The Panel particularly notes that the Respondent does not even dispute knowledge of the Complainant's CLAUDE mark at the time of registration but only argues that the mark was yet "not known on a global level".

As to bad faith use, the Panel finds that the Respondent is using the disputed domain names in bad faith by intentionally attempting to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's CLAUDE trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's websites. The Respondent's use of the Complainant's CLAUDE trademark in the disputed domain names, combined with the prominent display of the Complainant's logo (together with the logos of various other AI service providers) on the associated websites and the absence of any apparent disclaimer, reinforces this finding.

The fact that the disputed domain names currently do not resolve to active websites does not, in light of the above-noted circumstances, prevent a finding of bad faith. Contrary to the Respondent's arguments, the removal of content after the initiation of this UDRP proceeding does not cure or mitigate the Respondent's prior use. Rather, such removal, together with the Respondent's change of contact information following receipt of a cease-and-desist letter, is viewed by the Panel as further supporting an inference of bad faith use.

Consequently, the Panel is convinced that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain names in 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 names <claudегirl.com> and <cyberclaudе.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kaya Köklü/

Kaya Köklü

Sole Panelist

Date: February 12, 2026