

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

CTC Innovations, LLC v. zhangli, shang hai shan shi ke ji you xian gong si  
Case No. D2026-0117

### **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 zhangli, shang hai shan shi ke ji you xian gong si, China.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <testctcdigital.com> is registered with Metaregistrar BV (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 12, 2026. On January 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 14, 2026, 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 (“Metaregistrar BV”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 14, 2026, 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 January 14, 2026.

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 January 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Warwick A. Rothnie as the sole panelist in this matter on February 19, 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 an American company which carries on business in the field of financial services, providing various analytical and trading services, including participating in numerous derivatives exchanges globally. Through its venture capital arm, it provides investment services for cryptocurrency. According to the Complainant, it has been trading under the name Chicago Trading Company and the mark CTC for more than 20 years. At this point in time, it has offices in Chicago, New York, Amsterdam, and London.

The Complainant's LinkedIn account has some 30,000 followers. The Complainant has a website at "www.chicagotrading.com". The screenshot from the Complainant's website included in the Complaint shows the prominent use of the following trademarks:



As the symbols ® at the end of each element indicate, the Complainant has trademark registrations for both elements separately in a number of jurisdictions. For present purposes, the registered trademarks for CTC alone include:

- (1) United States Registered Trademark No 4,040,810, which has been registered in the Principal Register for proprietary trading of financial instruments in the nature of options, futures, debit instruments, and equities in International Class 36. This Trademark has been registered since October 18, 2011 and claims first use in commerce from October 2000;
- (2) European Union Trademark No 9886086 which was registered on September 22, 2011 in respect of a wide range of financial services related to trading in securities, financial instruments and intermediary services in International Class 36 and network traffic routing of electronic trading orders between mercantile exchanges or exchanges to reduce packet latency in International Class 38; and
- (3) Chinese Registered Trademark No 26300632 which was registered on October 14, 2019 in respect of fiduciary and lending against security services in International Class 36.

The Complaint lists similar registrations in numerous other jurisdictions. In addition, the Complainant has three registered trademarks for CTC DIGITAL:

- (4) Chinese Registered Trademark No 67738996 in respect of Art Appraisal, Fiduciary and Lending against Security Services in International Class 36, which was registered on October 14, 2024;
- (5) Chinese Registered Trademark No 70090782 in respect of Art Appraisal, Fiduciary and Lending against Security Services in International Class 36, which was registered on November 21, 2024; and
- (6) Swiss Registered Trademark No 791726 in respect of financial services, namely, proprietary trading of financial instruments in the nature of options, futures, debt instruments and equities; cryptocurrency trading services and digital asset trading services in International Class 36 and which was registered on January 11, 2023.

According to the WhoIs report, the disputed domain name was registered on November 7, 2025.

When the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name resolved to a website which appeared to be a gaming or gambling site. However, the Complainant states all of the links on the site to various games or services were inactive. From the screenshots included in the Complaint, the website presents as a gambling site under the name "tiyu1818.com". There is no apparent use of CTC on the website, apart from the URL.

When the Panel entered the disputed domain name into a web browser, the service provider blocked access.

## 5. Discussion and Findings

No response has been filed. The Complaint and Written Notice have been sent, however, to the Respondent at the electronic and physical coordinates confirmed as correct by the Registrar in accordance with paragraph 2(a) of the Rules. Bearing in mind the duty of the holder of a domain name to provide and keep up to date correct Whois details, therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent has been given a fair opportunity to present his or its case.

When a respondent has defaulted, paragraph 14(a) of the Rules requires the Panel to proceed to a decision on the Complaint in the absence of exceptional circumstances. Accordingly, paragraph 15(a) of the Rules requires the Panel to decide the dispute on the basis of the statements and documents that have been submitted and any rules and principles of law deemed applicable.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that in order to divest the Respondent of the disputed domain name, the Complainant must demonstrate 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; and
- (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

The first element that the Complainant must establish is that the disputed domain name is identical with, or confusingly similar to, the Complainant's trademark rights.

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 Select UDRP Questions, (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainant has proven ownership of registered trademarks for CTC DIGITAL and CTC.

The comparison of the disputed domain name to the Complainant's trademark simply requires a visual and aural comparison of the disputed domain name to the proven trademarks. This test is narrower than and thus different to the question of "likelihood of confusion" under trademark law. Therefore, questions such as the scope of the trademark rights, the geographical location of the respective parties, the date they were acquired and other considerations that may be relevant to an assessment of infringement under trademark law are not relevant at this stage. Such matters, if relevant, may fall for consideration under the other elements of the Policy. See e.g. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

In undertaking that comparison, it is permissible in the present circumstances to disregard the generic Top Level Domain (gTLD) component as a functional aspect of the domain name system. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.

Disregarding the “.com” gTLD, the disputed domain name consists of the Complainant’s CTC DIGITAL registered trademark and the term “test” and, in the case of the CTC registered trademark, adds “test” and “digital”. As this requirement under the Policy is essentially a standing requirement, these additions to the Complainant’s registered trademarks do not avoid a finding of confusing similarity. See e.g. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. Apart from anything else, the Complainant’s trademark remains visually and aurally recognisable within the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established that the disputed domain name is identical with the Complainant’s trademark and the requirement under the first limb of the Policy is satisfied.

## **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

The second requirement the Complainant must prove is that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides that the following circumstances can be situations in which the Respondent has rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name:

- (i) before any notice to [the Respondent] of the dispute, [the Respondent’s] use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the [disputed] domain name or a name corresponding to the [disputed] domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) [the Respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) has been commonly known by the [disputed] domain name, even if [the Respondent] has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) [the Respondent] is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the [disputed] domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

These are illustrative only and are not an exhaustive listing of the situations in which a respondent can show rights or legitimate interests in a domain name.

While 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 often impossible 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name after the Complainant began using the trademarks and also after the Complainant had registered them.

The Complainant states that it has not authorised the Respondent to use the disputed domain name. Nor is the Respondent affiliated with it.

The disputed domain name is not derived from the Respondent’s name. Nor is there any suggestion of some other name by which the Respondent is commonly known from which the disputed domain name could be derived. From the available record, the Respondent does not appear to hold any trademarks for the disputed domain name.

From the screenshots included in the Complaint, it does not appear that the site itself, or the services apparently being offered from it, have any connection with CTC or CTC DIGITAL. On the contrary, it appears to be operated under the banner “tiyu8181.com”. The Complainant points to the fact that the website is inactive and contends this suggests the site is really being used in connection with an exercise in phishing or the like.

The Panel is conscious that the Complainant’s trademark consists of a three letter acronym and the services are different. On the other hand, there is no apparent association between what is being offered, or apparently offered, on the Respondent’s website and the sign CTC. There is no evidence before the Panel to suggest that the Respondent has a practice of registering short, descriptive domain names for their intrinsic value. Accordingly, it appears likely, as the Complainant contends, that the Respondent is seeking to trade on an association with that term as another’s trademark. In addition, it appears from the Complainant’s following on LinkedIn that the Complainant has a significant degree of recognition in its field which includes cryptocurrency and there is likely to be some overlap between those involved in both fields.

In any event, it does not qualify as a good faith offering of goods or services for the purposes of paragraph 4(c)(i) to register and use a domain name because of its resemblance to another’s trademark.

These matters, taken together, are sufficient to establish a prima facie case under the Policy that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The basis on which the Respondent has adopted the disputed domain name, therefore, calls for explanation or justification. The Respondent, however, has not sought to rebut that prima facie case or advance any claimed entitlement. Accordingly, the Panel finds the Complainant has established the second requirement under the Policy also.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

Under the third requirement of the Policy, the Complainant must establish that the disputed domain name has been both registered and used in bad faith by the Respondent. These are conjunctive requirements; both must be satisfied for a successful complaint: see e.g. *Group One Holdings Pte Ltd v. Steven Hafto* WIPO Case No. [D2017-0183](#).

For the reasons discussed in section 5B, it appears that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name to take advantage of another’s reputation in the term CTC or CTC DIGITAL. That sort of opportunistic behaviour constitutes bad faith under the Policy. Accordingly, the Panel finds the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith. Putting the disputed domain name to use in furtherance of that plan qualifies as subsequent use in bad faith. All the more so if, as the Complainant suggests, the purpose of the Respondent’s website is an exercise in phishing or something of that nature.

Accordingly, the Complainant has established all three requirements under the Policy.

## **6. 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 <testctcdigital.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Warwick A. Rothnie/*

**Warwick A. Rothnie**

Sole Panelist

Date: March 5, 2026