

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Medical University of South Carolina v. Ilgam Nurtdinov
Case No. D2026-0400

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Medical University of South Carolina, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Ilgam Nurtdinov, Russian Federation.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <muscpfarm.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 31, 2026. On February 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On February 3, 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 February 3, 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 and an amendment to the Complaint respectively on February 10, 2026 and on February 11, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint and 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 12, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 6, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrew Sim as the sole panelist in this matter on March 11, 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 academic health science center based in South Carolina, United States. Its clinical enterprise, MUSC Health, is one of the leading and most preferred hospitals in South Carolina, and the only nationally recognized children's hospital in South Carolina. MUSC Health provides healthcare services through more than 100 outreach locations and records more than one million patient encounters annually. The Complainant also operates on-campus and mail-order pharmacy services for its patients through its website at "www.muschealth.org".

The Complainant holds several registered trademarks comprising the word "Musc" (the "Mark"), including:

Jurisdiction	Mark	Registration Number	Registration Date	Class Covered	Status
United States	MUSC	7037183	April 25, 2023	41, 42, and 44	Registered
	MUSC HEALTH	7358839	April 16, 2024	44	Registered
	MUSC MEDICAL UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA	3094683	May 23, 2006	41 and 44	Registered

The MUSC mark has been continuously used since 1969.

The Disputed Domain Name, <muscpfarm.com>, was registered on November 27, 2025. Based on the Complainant's evidence, it previously resolved to a website (the "Respondent's Website") purportedly operating an online pharmacy that included information directly related to MUSC and embedded content about the Complainant. On December 31, 2025, the Complainant sent a cease and desist letter ("C&D Letter") to the Registrar requesting that it either provide the registrant contact information or forward the C&D Letter to the registrant. The Complainant submits that no response to the C&D Letter was received. At the time of the Complaint and this decision, the Disputed Domain Name does not resolve to any active website.

Little information is known about the Respondent. Available information provided by the Registrar covers only the registrant's name, postal address, telephone number, and email address.

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.

First, the Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the MUSC Mark in which the Complainant has rights. The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the entirety of the MUSC Mark. The Complainant submits that the addition of the word "pharm" – a commonly known abbreviation for "pharmacy" or "pharmaceutical" relating to healthcare services – does not eliminate the likelihood of confusion, especially since such services fall within the scope of the protected classes. The Complainant also submits that the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is a standard registration requirement and shall be disregarded when assessing the confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the

MUSC Mark. Based on the above, the Complainant alleges that visitors are likely to believe that the Disputed Domain Name is associated with the healthcare services the Complainant provides.

Second, the Complainant contends that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name for the reasons below:

- (a) there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by any name incorporating "Musc" or the Disputed Domain Name;
- (b) the Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to register or use the Mark, nor is the Respondent affiliated with the Complainant in any form; and
- (c) the Respondent has not been using, or preparing to use, the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services, nor has the Respondent made a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name.

Third, the Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith for the reasons below:

- (a) the Mark is a well-known mark, and the registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name occurred many years after the Complainant's use of the Mark;
- (b) the Disputed Domain Name is used to attract visitors by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, affiliation or endorsement;
- (c) the registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name appears to be an attempt to rely on the Complainant's and its Mark's goodwill to drive traffic to the Respondent's Website resulting from visitors' confusion; and
- (d) the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant's rights in the Mark.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy states that, in an administrative proceeding, the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements:

- (a) the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (b) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name; and
- (c) the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

For the below reasons, support for the Complaint can be found due to the satisfaction of the three conditions for the Disputed Domain Name.

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 Select UDRP Questions ("[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 entirety of the MUSC Mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Although the addition of the term "pharm" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the MUSC Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. The gTLD ".com" is typically disregarded in the confusingly similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.

Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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 3.1](#), 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.

From the overall appearance of the Respondent's Website as described in section 4 above, the Panel finds that the Respondent's Website is being used for illegal or illegitimate activities purportedly impersonating the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, such as passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Particularly in regards to the three illustrative examples of legitimate interests in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, the Panel finds that:

- (a) the Respondent has not used the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services, as the Panel has ruled that the Respondent's Website is being used for illegal or illegitimate activities;
- (b) the Disputed Domain Name does not correspond with the Respondent's name (i.e., "Ilgam Nurtdinov"), and there is no evidence of the Respondent operating any business or organization with similar name as the Disputed Domain Name; and

(c) the Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name does not fall within the scope of legitimate noncommercial or fair use, as the Respondent's Website is being used for illegal or illegitimate activities.

The Panel also finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in using the Mark in the Disputed Domain Name.

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.

The Panel finds that the circumstances of registering and using the Disputed Domain Name clearly demonstrate the Respondent's bad faith and have constituted the situation as specified in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy:

(a) the MUSC Mark has been continuously used since 1969, long before the Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name which is confusingly similar to this Mark;

(b) based on the content of the Respondent's Website and the Complainant's evidence as to its reputation, the Panel finds that the Respondent must have had actual knowledge of the Complainant and the MUSC Mark, or at the very least, should have known of the MUSC Mark at the time of registering the Disputed Domain Name, as the MUSC Mark is reproduced in its entirety on the Respondent's Website;

(c) panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4. Given the long period of use of the MUSC Mark by the Complainant and the non-affiliation between the Complainant and the Respondent, the Panel accepts that the presumption of bad faith is applicable; and

(d) as earlier found in section 6B above that the Respondent's Website is being used for illegal or illegitimate activities, bad faith is manifestly apparent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Inference of bad faith is also drawn in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules for the Respondent's failure to file a response as required in paragraph 5(a) of the Rules in the absence of exceptional circumstances.

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 <muscpfarm.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrew Sim/

Andrew Sim

Sole Panelist

Date: March 25, 2026