

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

ТОВАРИСТВО З ОБМЕЖЕНОЮ ВІДПОВІДАЛЬНІСТЮ “МЕДИЧНИЙ ДІМ
“ОДРЕКС” (LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY “MEDICAL HOME ODREX”) v.

Yuliya Olenina

Case No. D2026-0179

1. The Parties

The Complainant is ТОВАРИСТВО З ОБМЕЖЕНОЮ ВІДПОВІДАЛЬНІСТЮ “МЕДИЧНИЙ ДІМ “ОДРЕКС” (LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY “MEDICAL HOME ODREX”) (LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY “MEDICAL HOME ODREX”), Ukraine, represented by Miller Law Firm, Ukraine.

The Respondent is “Yuliya Olenina”, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <stopodrex.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 16, 2026. On January 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On January 17, 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 (“Whois Privacy Protection Foundation”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 28, 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 amended Complaint on January 30, 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 February 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 22, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on February 20, 2026. The Complainant submitted unsolicited Supplemental Filings on February 16, and March 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Mariia Koval as the sole panelist in this matter on March 2, 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. Procedural Considerations

Respondent's location and procedural fairness

According to the paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel is required to ensure that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case, and also that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition.

Since the Respondent is apparently located in Ukraine, which is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision that may impact case notification, it is appropriate for the Panel to consider, in accordance with its discretion under paragraph 10 of the Rules, whether the proceeding should continue.

Having considered all the circumstances of the case, the Panel considers that it should, in view of the fact that not only was notification sent in accordance with the Rules, but the Respondent has participated in the proceedings.

Complainant's Unsolicited Supplemental Filings

The Complainant submitted a Supplemental Filing on February 16, 2026, in which the Complainant states that no data is available about the Respondent at the specified address; no records exist of any individual with such name and surname as the Respondent; the provided contact details of the Respondent (phone and email) are not linked to any real person and show signs of fictitious communication means; and the submitted information clearly bears signs of being fictitious, using false personal data and breaching the registration agreement with the Registrar (provision of knowingly false information).

The Complainant requests the Center to:

- verify the authenticity of the Respondent's registration data by directing official inquiries specifically to the named individual to the relevant Ukrainian authorities (and to the Registrar, in order to obtain passport data, taxpayer registration number, confirmation of the existence or non-existence of the Respondent and other identifying information precisely regarding this person, with the purpose of establishing whether such a person is registered in Ukrainian state registers, whether relevant documents were issued to her, and whether the provided registration data corresponds to reality;
- identify the actual individual or entity that registered and controls the Disputed Domain Name;
- verify the authority of any persons submitting documents, responses or acting on behalf of the Registrar;
- assess the Respondent's conduct in light of indicia of bad faith and provision of knowingly false data.

The Policy envisages prompt and efficient resolution of domain name disputes. Accordingly, the Rules and the Supplemental Rules only contemplate the filing of a complaint and a response, with fixed time and word limits. There is no explicit provision for additional filings, except for further statements or documents provided in response to a request from a panel. Paragraph 10 of the Rules provides that the panel is to conduct proceedings "with due expedition" and gives the Panel the power to "determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence". Generally, panels will only accept supplemental filings in "exceptional" circumstances. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.6.

The Panel considers all of the Complainant's requests contained in the above Supplemental Filing of February 16, 2026 as going beyond the nature and procedural principles of dispute resolution under the Policy and the Rules, which place the burden of proof solely on the parties to the dispute, and thus, denies the Complainant's requests in Supplemental Filing.

Noting however that the Response was submitted to the Center by an email address that differs from the one provided by the Registrar for the registrant of the Disputed Domain Name, the Panel finds it is appropriate to make a finding on the Respondent's identity.

The Panel notes that paragraph 1 of the Rules defines "Respondent" as "the holder of a domain-name registration against which a complaint is initiated" and that the appointed panel retains discretion to determine the respondent against which the case should proceed. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.4.5. The Registrar has disclosed "Yuliya Olenina" as the registrant of the disputed domain name. Although the Complainant claims that such person and contact details are fictitious, once the Registrar confirmed the Respondent name, the Complainant had an opportunity to research the named Respondent and provide evidence to support its allegations before the Complaint was notified, but has failed to do so. In view of the above, the Panel will proceed on the basis that the Registrar-disclosed registrant is the Respondent.

Moreover, even though the Panel notes that the Response was submitted through a different email address than the one provided by the Registrar but one that was displayed on the website at the Disputed Domain Name, the Panel will consider the Response as having been submitted by the Respondent and/or the person/entity responsible for the Disputed Domain Name.

Regarding the Complainant's Supplemental Filing of March 5, 2026 in reply to the Response, the Panel notes that such did not present any new factual contentions or arguments that could have not have been anticipated by the Complainant. The Panel rejects these proposed Complainant Supplemental Filings as they do not contain material that could not have been included in the Complaint or following the provision of the Respondent name by the Registrar.

Language of Proceedings

Pursuant to paragraph 11 of the Rules, unless otherwise agreed by the parties, the default language of the proceeding is the language of the registration agreement, subject to the authority of the panel to determine otherwise. The Registrar has confirmed English as the language of the Registrar Agreement for the Disputed Domain Name.

The Panel notes that the Complaint was submitted in English, but the Complainant has requested the proceedings to be conducted in Ukrainian, claiming that is the language of the website previously associated with the Disputed Domain Name; the Disputed Domain Name infringes on trademark rights registered in Ukraine; and "the registrar of the lower-level domain, [...], is also located in Ukraine".

The Respondent has submitted the Response in both English and Ukrainian, but has not commented on the Complainant's language request.

Noting both Parties seem to be able to communicate in English (and Ukrainian), and that the Panel is to conduct the proceedings with due expedition, the Panel will proceed to issue the Decision in English.

6. Factual Background

The Complainant is a medical centre in Ukraine providing a wide range of medical services. With 1,100 employees and over 4,500 types of medical services, the Complainant offers emergency care, a range of medical examinations, consultations with doctors in over 50 specialities, minimally invasive surgery and traumatology 24/7, an obesity treatment centre, a paediatric ward and a rehabilitation center.

The Complainant owns several trademark registrations comprised of "ODREX" (the "ODREX Trademark") in Ukraine, including:

- Ukrainian Trademark Registration No. 176256 for, 2013, in respect of services in classes 35 and 44;



registered on September 25,

- Ukrainian Trademark Registration No. 213274 for , registered on June 24, 2016, in respect of services in class 44;
- Ukrainian Trademark Registration No. 259907, for MEDICAL HUB ODREX, registered on June 10, 2019, in respect of services in class 44.

The Complainant operates domain name <odrex.ua>, where the ODREX Trademark is used and promoted for the Complainant's services. The Complainant also operates pages on various social media platforms, particularly Facebook, Instagram, LinkedIn, and YouTube.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on December 6, 2025. As at the date of filing the Complaint the Disputed Domain Name resolved to the website in Ukrainian, where testimonials from patients and relatives about treatment at the Complainant's medical center were collected (Annexes 12, 14, and 16 to the Complaint). However, as of the date of this Decision, when accessing via a desktop, the Disputed Domain Name either goes to a "secure connection failed": page, or redirects to another website where the following message appears: "Safety warning! You might recently browsed to compromised websites that are most likely infected with viruses" or redirects to parked webpages, containing different pay-per-click ("PPC") links to third-party websites (with multiple links expressly referencing the medical treatment). At the same time, the website under the Disputed Domain Name is also accessible via mobile phone and, every time accessing it, the Disputed Domain Name redirects to different websites with different products and services. The Complainant did not provide evidence showing any use of the Disputed Domain Name through mobile phone at the time of filing of the Complaint.

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 Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's ODREX Trademark since the Disputed Domain Name reproduces the Complainant's ODREX Trademark in its entirety.

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name in view of the following. The website under the Disputed Domain Name contained statements that directly relate to the activities of the Complainant, used the Complainant's ODREX Trademark and created a negative image of the Complainant. In particular, the statement is published on the website: "Let's stop the negligence of Odrex doctors!" The use of this expression with the use of the ODREX Trademark without the Complainant's consent was aimed at discrediting the Complainant, harmed its business reputation and misled unlimited number of consumers regarding the quality and nature of the Complainant's medical services. In addition, the Respondent was not known under the Disputed Domain Name, did not acquire rights to it, acted anonymously and uses the Disputed Domain Name with the aim of misleading consumers and causing reputational damage to the Complainant.

The Complainant further claims that the Respondent has registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith. The website under the Disputed Domain Name used the Complainant's ODREX Trademark and graphic elements similar to the degree of confusion with the ODREX Trademark. Moreover, the design of the Respondent's website was made using the same or similar to the degree of confusion color scheme, style and visual solutions used on the Complainant's official website. Therefore, the Respondent's website created a direct association with the Complainant and parasitized on its reputation. This misled potential consumers of the Complainant, caused reputational and financial damage, and exhibited characteristics of unfair competition and trademark infringement. By using the Disputed Domain Name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's ODREX Trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website.

In its unsolicited Supplemental Filing of February 16, 2026, the Complainant also states that no data is available regarding the Respondent; no records exist of any individual with such name and surname as the Respondent; the provided contact details of the Respondent (phone and email) are not linked to any real person and show signs of fictitious communication means; and the submitted information clearly bears signs of being fictitious, using false personal data and breaching the registration agreement with the Registrar (provision of knowingly false information).

B. Respondent

On February 20, 2026, the Respondent submitted a formal Response to the Complainant's contentions. The Respondent requests that the Complaint be denied based on the following.

The Respondent contends that the ODREX Trademark is used exclusively:

- for identification purposes;
- to designate the entity in relation to which socially significant information activities are carried out;
- without the use of logos, commercial design, or identity; and
- without positioning the site as an official resource.

Such use complies with the principle of nominative (descriptive) use of the ODREX Trademark, which does not constitute an infringement of intellectual property rights.

The Respondent further states that the Complainant failed to prove:

- the use of the ODREX Trademark in the economic activities of the Respondent;
- the existence of the Respondent's commercial benefit;
- the creation of likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's official website; and
- damage to business reputation.

The website under the Disputed Domain Name does not sell medical services, does not use the ODREX Trademark as its own, and does not compete with the Complainant.

The Respondent also claims that testimonials were collected via its website exclusively on the initiative of individuals, on a voluntary basis, and with an indication of the purpose of processing.

7. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, a complainant to succeed must satisfy the panel that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which 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 was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Disputed Domain Name completely reproduces the Complainant's ODTREX Trademark in combination with the additional term "stop" and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com". According to the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8, where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. The addition of the term "stop" to the ODTREX Trademark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity in this case.

According to the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1, the applicable gTLD in a domain name (e.g., ".com", ".club", ".nyc") is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's ODTREX Trademark pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

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 that 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 3.1](#), section 2.1.

The Complainant has provided evidence (Annexes 12, 14, and 16 to the Complaint) that as of the date of filing the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to the website upon which were collected the testimonials from the users with respect to the Complainant's medical business. The use of a complainant's trademark in connection with a criticism website has been the subject of numerous prior decisions under the UDRP, the conclusions of which are summarized in section 2.6 of [WIPO Overview 3.1](#):

"UDRP jurisprudence recognizes that the use of a domain name for fair use such as noncommercial free speech, would in principle support a respondent's claim to a legitimate interest under the Policy.

2.6.1 To support fair use under UDRP paragraph 4(c)(iii), the respondent's criticism must be genuine (i.e., not pretextual); in a number of UDRP decisions where a respondent has argued that its domain name is or was being used for free speech purposes, the panel has found the claimed use to be primarily a pretext for cybersquatting, commercial activity, or tarnishment.

In assessing the genuineness of criticism, mindful that there may be a difference of opinion or factual dispute between the parties, panels do not look at the veracity or accuracy of the criticism as such, nor any allegations that the criticism is defamatory in nature; rather they will look at whether the motivation behind the criticism is genuine, as opposed to being a sham or pretext to hide another motive such as cybersquatting or commercial activity.

2.6.2 Panels have increasingly found that even a general right to legitimate criticism does not necessarily extend to registering or using a domain name identical to a trademark (i.e., <trademark.tld> (including typos)); even where such a domain name is used in relation to genuine noncommercial free speech, panels tend to find that such a domain name creates an impermissible risk of user confusion through impersonation.

NB, as explained in sections 2.5 and 2.5.1, in cases where the disputed domain name is not identical to the complainant's trademark but adds a term, panels have applied a range of factors such as those articulated in section 2.5.2 in assessing whether a criticism site is genuine and not pretextual.

2.6.3 Where the domain name is not identical to the complainant's trademark, but it comprises the mark plus a derogatory term (e.g., <trademarksucks.tld>), panels tend to find that the respondent has a legitimate interest in using the trademark as part of the domain name of a genuine criticism site if such use is prima facie, genuinely fair, and not misleading or false. Some panels have found in such cases that a degree of commercial activity may be permissible (e.g., as "fundraising" to offset registration or hosting costs associated with the domain name and website)."

In this case, there is no evidence that the Respondent intended to profit from the platform collecting testimonials against the Complainant and its services. The Panel notes, however, that it expresses no view on the veracity or otherwise of the Respondent's platform for criticisms of the Complainant, which is a matter beyond the scope of this proceeding and not relevant to its outcome.

The website under the Disputed Domain Name contained the following information:

"Have you suffered treatment at ORDEX?"

And further:

"Who is behind this initiative? We are patients and relatives of those who have faced the consequences of treatment at the Odrex clinic. We are uniting for the restoration of justice. You can join us- your story matters. You will be heard here!

Our goal is to unite those who know first hand about manipulation and abuse at the Odrex clinic, those who lost their health after treatment there, and the relatives of those whose deaths are related to the actions of the clinic staff.

We have no connection with the clinic.

We are not affiliated with its competitors.

We do not intend to "squeeze" the Odrex clinic

We are not going to donate, we are not selling services"

The Panel understands these statements of the Respondent as a confirmation that the Respondent is not only itself seeking to exercise free speech rights, but also provides an online platform for third parties who may eventually wish to exercise their free speech rights.

The Panel notes that some patients stories are present on the Respondent's website under the section "News" about the Complainant (Annex 16 of the Complaint). The website implies but did seem to not contain any direct criticisms of the Respondent itself against the Complainant. The Complainant has argued that contact information in the Whols for the Disputed Domain Name is false, and the Complainant has no knowledge who the real entity/individual behind the Respondent's website is. The Respondent's website itself contained no contact information, except Telegram channel, Gmail and TikTok. Also, the Response submitted by the Respondent has neither signature nor name of the author. The Panel notes that a degree of anonymity may be inherent in the nature of certain criticism websites, particularly where the operator of the website and individuals wish to express critical views without disclosing their identity. In the Panel's view, such prior use of the Disputed Domain Name is consistent with the overall nature of the website as a criticism site, intended for the exercise of freedom of speech.

With regards to the current use of the Disputed Domain Name, in particular redirection to another different websites and inclusion of the PPC links, the evidence presented by the Complainant (Annex 9 to the Complaint), indicates that the Disputed Domain Name could have been suspended by the hosting provider. It is therefore likely that redirection to other websites and PPC advertisements could have been implemented by the Registrar automatically, for its own benefit, without any initiative from or benefit to the Respondent. Although the Panel notes that a respondent cannot disclaim responsibility for content appearing on the website associated with its domain name, noting the prior use of the Disputed Domain Name in connection to

what the Panel considers legitimate criticism, and, noting that, in accordance with section 2.11 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), panels tend to assess claimed respondent rights or legitimate interests in the present, i.e., with a view to the circumstances prevailing at the time of the filing of the complaint, the Panel finds that such subsequent use of the Disputed Domain Name does not alter the Panel's finding of legitimate interests of the Respondent in the case .

The Complainant contends that the Respondent may not claim the benefit of fair use because the Disputed Domain Name contains the Complainant's entire ODTREX Trademark. The Disputed Domain Name is not identical to the Complainant's ODTREX Trademark – it also contains the protest word “stop.” See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.6.2. Where a domain name is in the form <trademark.tld>, most panels hold that the corresponding website cannot be considered a legitimate criticism site. Panels find – as long as the content is in fact critical and is not a ruse for cybersquatting – that the addition of another obviously critical word, such as “sucks,” supports a finding of legitimate criticism because the negative word immediately communicates to Internet users before they access the domain name that such is not sponsored by the complainant. *Yellowstone Mountain Club LLC v. Offshore Limited D and PCI.*, WIPO Case No. [D2013-0097](#) (<yellowstoneclubscandal.com> not transferred as it alerts Internet users that site is critical of the complainant); *Mr. Willem Vedovi, Galerie Vedovi S.A. v. Domains by Proxy, LLC / Jane Kelly*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-0780](#) (no fair use because disputed domain names “do not include any additional word or term that may identify themselves as resolving to criticism website.”).

Also, the presence of the disclaimer on the Respondent's website in the Disputed Domain Name is sufficient, in Panel's view, to dispel any risk of implied affiliation or impersonation.

Where, as in the present case, the Disputed Domain Name includes a critical/protest term “stop”, the content of the website should be considered, and a fair use defense should not be denied without doing so. Moreover, “[t]he content of the website associated with the domain name is usually disregarded by panels when assessing confusing similarity under the first element... Such content will often bear on the assessment of the second and third elements...”. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.15; see also *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. Richard MacLeod d/b/a For Sale*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0662](#) (<walmartsucks.com> is “identical or confusingly similar,” noting that the “legitimate interest” and “bad faith” factors should adequately insulate true protest sites from vulnerability under the Policy...”). Because consideration of the website content is not part of the evaluation of the first element, there is greater need to consider the content under the second element, especially because a rejection of a fair use defense will in many cases go hand-in-hand with a finding of bad faith registration and use. For these reasons, it is necessary on these facts to consider the content of Respondent's website. The Panel finds that the content of the website under the Disputed Domain Name reflects legitimate criticism and, accordingly, that Complainant has not satisfied Policy element 4(a)(ii).

On balance, bearing in mind that the overall burden of proof is on the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Complainant has not proven that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name in order to use it for cybersquatting purposes. See also *Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association v. Paul McCauley*, WIPO Case No. [D2004-0014](#) (denying complaint where “Respondent's website appears to be a classic criticism site” and there was no evidence of intent to derive commercial gain or tarnish complainant's mark). In view of the circumstances of the present case the Panel is satisfied that the website under the Disputed Domain Name was a legitimate “criticism site” and thereby represented a genuine and fair use, and that it may give rise to rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the Disputed Domain Name under the Policy.

In view of the foregoing, the Panel finds that the Respondent has rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name and that the Complainant did not succeed under the second element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Because the Complainant did not satisfy the second element, there is usually no need to address the third element. However, for the sake of completeness, the Panel considers it appropriate to make the following brief observations.

As the evidence submitted indicates, given that genuine criticism appears to be made at the website that previously resolved from the Disputed Domain Name, it leads the Panel to conclude that the registration of the Disputed Domain Name which the Panel finds to have a negative connotation does not, of itself, tarnish the ODREX Trademark and show bad faith registration. In this case, there is no evidence that the Respondent intended to profit from the platform collecting testimonials against the Complainant and its services.

The Complainant does not establish that the Respondent is a “competitor” in any commercial sense but argues that the Respondent nonetheless seeks to disrupt its business. The Complainant asserts that the website under the Disputed Domain Name contained negative statements that directly relate to the activities of the Complainant, creating thereby a negative image of the Complainant, discrediting the Complainant, harming its business reputation and misleading unlimited number of consumers regarding the quality and nature of the Complainant’s medical services. The Panel again expresses no view on the on the veracity of the statements contained in the Disputed Domain Name; however, the Panel notes that the mere assertion that the Disputed Domain Name may negatively impact the Complainant’s business is not, in itself, considered by panels as amounting to bad faith registration for the purposes of the Policy.

The Panel notes that the website under the Disputed Domain Name primarily collected testimonials purportedly submitted by third parties and did not appear to include direct statements of criticism authored by the Respondent itself. However, this circumstance does not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith.

The Panel finds that the foregoing does not constitute registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied.

/Mariia Koval/

Mariia Koval

Sole Panelist

Date: March 26, 2026