

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Calibrium AG and C Partners Holding GmbH v. Alexix Maricc  
Case No. D2026-0280

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainants are Calibrium AG, Switzerland, and C Partners Holding GmbH, Switzerland, represented by Nieder Kraft & Frey, Switzerland.

The Respondent is Alexix Maricc, Canada.

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

The disputed domain name <calibriumag.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 23, 2026. On January 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 23, 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 (redacted for privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on January 28, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amendment to the Complaint on February 4, 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 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 25, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 27, 2026.

The Center appointed Linda Chang as the sole panelist in this matter on March 4, 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**

Two Complainants filed the Complaint. The First Complainant is Calibrium AG, and the Second Complainant is C Partners Holding GmbH (collectively, the “Complainants”). The Complainants are related companies within the same group. The Complainants are single-family offices based in Zurich, Switzerland providing financial service and making private equity and venture capital investments.

The Second Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for CALIBRIUM, including:

- The Switzerland trademark CALIBRIUM Registration No. 696529, registered on December 13, 2016, in class 36;
- The International trademark CALIBRIUM Registration No. 1348832, registered on March 22, 2017, in class 36; and
- The United Kingdom trademark CALIBRIUM Registration No. UK00801348832, registered on November 10, 2017, in class 36.

The Respondent is based in Canada. The Respondent registered the dispute domain name on January 9, 2026. Presently, the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive website. According to the Complainants’ evidence, the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website displaying the Complainants’ CALIBRIUM trademark, the name of the First Complainant – CALIBRIUM AG, and the Complainants’ address , and purportedly offering the Complainants’ financial and investment services.

#### **5. Parties’ Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainants contend that:

- i) the disputed domain name consists of the Complainants’ CALIBRIUM trademark in its entirety, with the mere addition of the First Complainant’s legal form “ag” (“ag” is the commonly used and official abbreviation for the German term “Aktiengesellschaft”, denoting a Company Limited by Shares). The addition of the First Complainant’s legal form “ag” does nothing to distinguish the disputed domain name from the CALIBRIUM trademark. On the contrary, it reinforces an impression that the disputed domain name is connected to the Complainants. The generic Top Level-Domain “.com” is likewise disregarded as a standard technical requirement. In addition, the content on the website associated with the disputed domain name is carefully designed to create confusing similarity. Therefore, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainants’ CALIBRIUM trademark;
- ii) The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainants and has not been authorized to use the Complainants’ trademark in any form. The Respondent does not appear to be commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent does not appear to hold any trademark rights corresponding to the disputed domain name;

iii) the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The website associated with the disputed domain name is a copycat website of the Complainants. Given that the Respondent uses the Complainants' CALIBRIUM trademark to falsely claim to offer the Complainants' financial services, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent may be engaging in unlicensed financial activities or may even intend to deceive the public and misappropriate assets. Using the disputed domain name for unlawful activities, including phishing and impersonation, cannot establish any rights or legitimate interests for the Respondent;

iv) the Complainants' CALIBRIUM trademark is a distinctive term and has been well established in the financial industry. The Complainants' CALIBRIUM trademark was registered far predating the disputed domain name. It is highly unlikely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name by coincidence. In addition, the disputed domain name consists of the Complainants' CALIBRIUM trademark together with the term "ag" that denotes the First Complainant's legal form, which is also indicative of bad faith registration; and

v) the website associated with the disputed domain name displayed the Complainants' CALIBRIUM trademark, the name of the First Complainant, and the Complainants' address, and purported to offer the Complainants' financial services. This content appears to have been copied from the Complainants and was intended to create a likelihood of confusion. Further, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name as described could reasonably suggest that the Respondent may be conducting unlicensed financial activities or may have no genuine intention to provide the stated financial services but instead seek to deceive the public and misappropriate assets. Using the disputed domain name for illegitimate activities constitutes evidence of bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainants' contentions.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **6.1. Procedural Issues – Consolidation of the Complainants**

The two Complainants have filed one single Complaint together against the Respondent.

The Complainants have convinced the Panel that the First Complainant and the Second Complainant are related companies that share a common grievance and legal interests in the CALIBRIUM trademark, and their commercial rights are both targeted by the Respondent's conduct of registering and using the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Panel determines that it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to consolidate the Complainants in this administrative proceeding. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.11.1.

### **6.2. Substantive Issues**

#### **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 Complainants' trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainants have shown rights in respect of the CALIBRIUM trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The gTLD “.com” as a standard registration requirement “should be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The entirety of the CALIBRIUM trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. While the term “ag” is included, the CALIBRIUM trademark remains clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that the extra term does not prevent the finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the CALIBRIUM trademark. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the CALIBRIUM trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 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 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 available record shows that:

- the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainants and has not been authorized to use the Complainants’ CALIBRIUM trademark in any form;
- there is no evidence proving that the Respondent holds any trademark rights corresponding to the disputed domain name, or has been commonly known by the disputed domain name;
- the disputed domain name currently resolves to an inactive website but previously resolved to a website displaying the Complainants’ CALIBRIUM trademark, the name of the First Complainant – CALIBRIUM AG, and the Complainants’ address, and purportedly offering the Complainants’ financial and investment services, without any prominent and accurate explanation of the relationship (or lack thereof) between the Parties. Such use of the disputed domain name indicates the Respondent’s intention to divert Internet traffic to the website associated with the disputed domain name by confusing the relationship between the website associated with the disputed domain name and the Complainants, which cannot be deemed as a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use;
- the nature of the disputed domain name, incorporating the Complainants’ CALIBRIUM trademark, together with the term “ag” that may refer to the abbreviation for the German term “Aktiengesellschaft”, denoting a Company Limited by Shares and the First Complainant’s legal form, and being identical to the name of the First Complainant, carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainants; and

- no other factors demonstrate any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain name.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainants have established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainants' 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.

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 the Complainants obtained the trademark registration for CALIBRIUM as early as December 13, 2016, which significantly predates the registration date of the disputed domain name (January 9, 2026). According to the Complainants' evidence and the Panel's own search, the Panel accepts that the Complainants' CALIBRIUM trademark is well established in numerous jurisdictions and is well recognized in the financial industry. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name that fully incorporates the Complainants' CALIBRIUM trademark and resolved the disputed domain name to a website displaying the Complainants' CALIBRIUM trademark, the name of the First Complainant, and the Complainants' address, and purportedly offering the Complainants' financial and investment services. The Panel determines that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainants and the CALIBRIUM trademark at the time of registering the disputed domain name, and bad faith is found.

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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The disputed domain name resolves to an inactive website at the time of Decision but was once used to host a website displaying the Complainants' CALIBRIUM trademark, the name of the First Complainant, the Complainants' address, and purportedly offering the Complainants' financial and investment services. The Panel holds that by selecting a domain name confusingly similar to the Complainants' CALIBRIUM trademark, and using it in the manner as described, the Respondent obviously intended to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the disputed domain name and the associated website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainants' CALIBRIUM trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website associated with the disputed domain name, which constitutes bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. In addition, financial and investment services are inherently sensitive, as they directly implicate consumers' funds and information security. In the absence of any evidence to prove the Respondent's qualification to provide such services, the Respondent's previous use of the disputed domain name would highly likely create financial security risk.

Given the Respondent's previous use of the disputed domain name, the current non-use of the disputed domain name does not prevent the Panel's finding of the Respondent's bad faith.

The Panel finds that the Complainants have 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 <calibriumag.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Linda Chang/*

**Linda Chang**

Sole Panelist

Date: March 18, 2026