

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

**BTCS Holding AG and Bitcoin Suisse AG v. travon**  
**Case No. D2026-1754**

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainants are BTCS Holding AG, Switzerland and Bitcoin Suisse AG, Switzerland, represented by FMP Fuhrer Marbach & Partners, Switzerland. (References to “the Complainant” below include both Complainants.)

The Respondent is travon, Austria.

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

The disputed domain name <bitcoinsuisseweb.info> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 24, 2026. On April 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 27, 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 (Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org)) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 29, 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 April 29, 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 May 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 25, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 27, 2026.

The Center appointed Adam Taylor as the sole panelist in this matter on June 9, 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 has provided cryptocurrency services under the mark BITCOIN SUISSE for over a decade. The Complainant has some 6 billion “crypto assets” in custody, with over 200 employees.

The Complainant owns a number of registered trade marks for BITCOIN SUISSE including Swiss trade mark No. 710728, registered on December 12, 2017, in classes 9, 14, 36 and 42.

The Complainant operates a website at “www.bitcoinsuisse.com”.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 1, 2026.

There is no evidence or indication that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name for an active website.

#### **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.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

#### **6. Discussion and Findings**

##### **6.1. Preliminary Issue: Consolidation - Multiple Complainants**

The Panel is satisfied that (a) the Complainants, which are part of a group of companies, have a specific common grievance against the Respondent and the Respondent has engaged in common conduct that has affected the Complainants in similar fashion and (b) it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to allow this proceeding to be filed by both Complainants. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 4.11.

##### **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 Complainant’s trade mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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

The Panel finds that the mark is recognisable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, “web”) 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 mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 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 recognised 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.

As to paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, there is no evidence that the disputed domain name is being, or ever has been, used for an active website, let alone for a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Nor is there any evidence that paragraphs 4(c)(ii) or (iii) of the Policy are relevant in the circumstances of this case.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

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

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.

Panels have found that, in looking at the totality of circumstances, the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel considers that the following circumstances are indicative of passive holding in bad faith:

1. the fame of the Complainant’s mark;
2. the disputed domain name’s close resemblance to the Complainant’s own domain name <bitcoinsuisse.com>;

3. the failure of the Respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use; and
4. taking the above factors into consideration, the implausibility of any potential good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put in light of its composition.

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 <bitcoinsuisseweb.info> be transferred to the First Complainant.

*/Adam Taylor/*

**Adam Taylor**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 19, 2026