

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

MediCrops AG v. Benjamin Williams, BC News LLC
Case No. D2026-0876

1. The Parties

The Complainant is MediCrops AG, Switzerland, represented by Niederer Kraft Frey Ltd, Switzerland.

The Respondent is Benjamin Williams, BC News LLC, United States of America (“United States”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <medicrops.org> is registered with CloudFlare, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 27, 2026. On February 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 28, 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 (“DATA REDACTED”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 2, 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 March 5, 2026.

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”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 12, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 1, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Luca Barbero as the sole panelist in this matter on April 14, 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 a Swiss-based pharmaceutical and health-tech company founded in 2019. The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations for MEDICROPS, including the following, as per trademark registration details provided in Annexes 3 and 7 to the Complaint:

- European Union trademark registration No. 018085362 for MEDICROPS (figurative mark), filed on June 25, 2019, and registered on December 11, 2019, in class 5;
- Switzerland trademark registration No. 732912 for MEDICROPS (figurative mark), filed on June 26, 2019, and registered on June 27, 2019, in class 5;
- United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK00918085362 for MEDICROPS (figurative mark), filed on June 25, 2019, and registered on December 11, 2019, in class 5; and
- Switzerland trademark registration No. 780566 for MEDICROPS (figurative mark), filed on April 14, 2022, and registered on May 2, 2022, in classes 5, 40 and 42.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <medicrops.com> which is used by the Complainant to promote its products and services under the trademark MEDICROPS.

The disputed domain name <medicrops.org> was registered on November 22, 2025, and is pointed to a webpage where it is stated that the website is currently suspended. According to the screenshots submitted as Annexes 4 and 5 to the Complaint – which have not been contested by the Respondent – prior to the present proceedings, it pointed to what seemed to be a criticism website in German. The website featured an illustration of a woman running toward a money trap. A note published in smaller font below the picture informed Internet users that the statements on the website reflected only personal opinions and did not constitute investment advice, recommendation to buy or sell or claim to completeness.

The website included the following statements about the Complainant (according to the translation provided by the Complainant): “Although prices are displayed on individual portals, we do not currently recognize any significant organized trading, so that, in our view, it is difficult to derive a reliable market price. As far as we can see, no listing can be inferred from publicly available information. Capital measures seem to us to be more in line with an early, speculative phase of the company. Based on the information available to us, we cannot conclusively assess whether the valuations mentioned are reasonable. We have not found any detailed, publicly available financial figures that would enable us to make an informed assessment (e.g., sales, cash flows, or operating performance). It is common practice for an auditor to perform statutory audits; however, we do not derive any conclusions about the quality or valuation of the company from this. Overall, we find it difficult to assess the valuation and potential tradability of shares in MediCrops AG based on publicly available sources. Whether and when an exit – e.g., through an IPO or buyer – would be realistic remains uncertain in our view. Where we refer to probabilities or risks, these are expressly our personal assessments and not verified facts”; “Compared to established, publicly traded healthcare companies [...], transparency, liquidity, and traceability generally appear to be more clearly structured in those companies. Early-stage investments, on the other hand, often appear more speculative, with lower tradability and more limited protection mechanisms. This is solely our personal assessment”; and “In our view, a potential investment in an unlisted company such as MediCrops AG is more akin to an early-stage commitment with increased uncertainties regarding transparency, liquidity, and exit opportunities. Without reliable, publicly available data, we are currently unable to make a reliable assessment. In our opinion, anyone considering such opportunities should be particularly cautious, conduct their own research, and seek professional advice”.

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 trademark MEDICROPS in which the Complainant has rights as it consists of the entire textual component of the Complainant's trademark, with the mere addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".org".

The Complainant states that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name since: i) the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized to use its trademark in any form; ii) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name; iii) the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name falsely suggests affiliation with the Complainant, considering it is identical to the textual element of the Complainant's marks; iv) the Respondent has not been using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use since the website, which is currently suspended, initially displayed defamatory information on the Complainant, disseminating misleading and harmful content targeting the Complainant's reputation and was suspended only following receipt of the Complainant's cease and desist letter sent on February 2, 2026. The Complainant submits that the content published on the Respondent's website was not genuine criticism, but rather defamatory and misleading material designed to harm the Complainant, as the Respondent did not comment on the Complainant's brand or products but made the Complainant look as though its financial situation was much worse than it in fact is, thereby clearly targeting potential investors and shareholders with such false information. The Complainant also points out that the Respondent alluded to an investment into the Complainant being particularly risky and unsafe – hiding behind overblown disclaimers and pretense – and notes that this is further emphasized by the illustration originally displayed on top of the website's content.

With reference to the circumstances evidencing bad faith, the Complainant indicates that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its trademark MEDICROPS at the time of registration of the disputed domain name considering the Complainant's prior trademark registrations, the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the confusing similarity of the disputed domain name with the trademark and the past content of the Respondent's website.

The Complainant further points out that the presence of a disclaimer is not sufficient to cure the Respondent's bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name and submits that the Respondent "reserved" the disputed domain name to block the Complainant from reflecting its trademark in a corresponding domain name.

The Complainant also states that the Respondent provided likely inaccurate contact information since, according to its verifications, there is reason to believe that the named registrant either does not exist or may only be a proxy or straw entity. In this regard, the Complainant asserts that, prior to the suspension of the website published through the disputed domain name, the associated website content was written entirely in German, which is inconsistent with what would ordinarily be expected from a purported United States-based company.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules: “A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.” Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) that the disputed domain name registered by the Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been 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 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. Indeed, the Complainant has provided evidence of ownership of valid trademark registrations for MEDICROPS figurative marks.

The Panel finds the disputed domain name reproduces the textual component of the Complainant’s trademark without any variation and is identical thereto. To the extent that design elements would be incapable of representation in domain names, these elements can be disregarded for purposes of assessing identity or confusing similarity under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.10.

In addition, the gTLD “.org” can be disregarded under the first element test, being a standard registration requirement. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Therefore, 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.

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.

The Panel notes that there is no relation, disclosed to the Panel or otherwise apparent from the record, between the Respondent and the Complainant. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor has the Respondent otherwise obtained an authorization to use the Complainant's trademark.

Moreover, there is no element from which the Panel could infer the Respondent's rights over the disputed domain name, or that the Respondent might be commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name, which currently resolves to a suspended website, was previously directed to a prima facie criticism website that provided comments about the Complainant, which essentially suggested that investing in the Complainant could be risky. The Respondent indeed expressly stated that "a potential investment in an unlisted company such as MediCrops AG is more akin to an early-stage commitment with increased uncertainties regarding transparency, liquidity, and exit opportunities".

The Panel noted the Respondent's notice that its statements reflected solely its personal opinion and understanding and did not constitute investment advice, and that it was open to corrections. However, the Panel also noted the picture prominently displayed on the website featuring a money trap, which suggests that investing in the Complainant could be unsafe.

As stated in section 2.6.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), to support fair use under UDRP paragraph 4(c)(iii), the respondent's criticism must be genuine and not be a pretext for cybersquatting, commercial activity, or tarnishment.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent's website included general comments about the Complainant which were mostly related to the absence of publicly available information on the Complainant due to the fact that it is not listed on the stock exchange. The website, however, did not include any reference to any concrete investment experiences of the Respondent or any third party with the Complainant.

Even assuming that the motivation behind the Respondent's criticism was genuine, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name is identical to the textual component of the Complainant's trademark, and notes that UDRP panels have increasingly found that a general right to legitimate criticism does not necessarily extend to registering or using a domain name identical to a trademark, since panels tend to find that such a domain name creates an impermissible risk of user confusion through impersonation. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.6.2.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name can mislead Internet users into believing that the website is owned or operated by, or otherwise affiliated with, the Complainant, which does not give rise to rights or legitimate interests on the part of the Respondent, even if it was used for a genuine criticism site.

Therefore, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has also 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, in view of the Complainant's prior registration and use of the trademark MEDICROPS in connection with the Complainant's business, promoted online via the Complainant's website at "www.medicrops.com", the Panel finds that the Respondent knew or should have known the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

Moreover, the circumstance that the disputed domain name is identical to the textual component of the Complainant's mark and the explicit reference to the Complainant on the website to which the disputed

domain name initially resolved suggest that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name having the Complainant in mind.

As highlighted above, the disputed domain name resolved, prior to the filing of the Complaint, to a criticism website related to the Complainant, which was suspended after the Respondent had received the Complainant's cease and desist letter.

Even considering that the disputed domain name was used in connection with a genuine criticism site, that would not alter the fact that the disputed domain name creates an impermissible risk of user confusion through impersonation.

The disputed domain name currently does not resolve to an active website. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark and the composition of the disputed domain name, and considering the Respondent's failure to submit a Response, finds that in the circumstances of this case the current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy as well.

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 <medicrops.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Luca Barbero/

Luca Barbero

Sole Panelist

Date: April 28, 2026