

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

MP Acquisition Corp. v. Lowe Claudia

Case No. D2026-2651

1. The Parties

The Complainant is MP Acquisition Corp., United States of America (“United States”), represented by McGrath North Mullin & Kratz, PC LLO, United States.

The Respondent is Lowe Claudia, Germany.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <musclepharmeuropa.com> is registered with CNOBIN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LIMITED (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 18, 2026. On June 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 22, 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 (WhoisGuard Protected / WhoisGuard, Inc. and/or the true underlying registrant of musclepharmeuropa.com / Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 23, 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 the same day.

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 July 1, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 21, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 27, 2026.

The Center appointed Douglas Clark as the sole panelist in this matter on July 29, 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 MP Acquisition Corp., a Nevada corporation in the United States. The Complainant owns the MUSCLEPHARM brand, which is used in connection with the marketing and sale of dietary and nutritional supplements and related sports nutrition products. The Complainant is the owner of various trademark registrations for MUSCLEPHARM and related marks used in connection with such products.

These include, among others:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 3,933,441 for MUSCLEPHARM, registered on March 22, 2011, in International Class 5 for dietary and nutritional supplements;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 7,513,197 for MP MUSCLEPHARM, registered on September 24, 2024, in International Class 5 for dietary and nutritional supplements and powdered nutritional supplement drink mix.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 14, 2026.

The Registrar disclosed that the underlying registrant was an individual with an address in Germany.

The disputed domain name resolved to a website offering dietary and nutritional supplement products for sale under the MUSCLEPHARM name and branding.

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 (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and (iii) the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Complainant submits that it has no affiliation with the Respondent, nor has it authorized the Respondent to register or use a domain name, which includes the Complainant's marks, and that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the registration of the disputed domain name. Rather, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has acted in bad faith in acquiring the disputed domain name, when the Respondent knew of the Complainant's rights.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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.

In the present case, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks. The Panel finds that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark MUSCLEPHARM in its entirety. The addition of the term "europe" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the Policy.

The Panel notes that the trademark registrations in evidence are in the United States, whereas the Respondent has been identified through Registrar verification as an individual in Germany. It is nevertheless well established that a complainant is not required to hold trademark rights in the jurisdiction in which a respondent is located in order to satisfy paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. This issue may, however, be relevant to the assessment of the second and third elements of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.1.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights. The first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has therefore 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 Panel further notes that UDRP panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, including passing off or other forms of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1. In the present case, the record indicates that the disputed domain name was used for a website offering products under the Complainant's MUSCLEPHARM name and branding in a manner that falsely suggested an affiliation with, endorsement by, or connection to the Complainant.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that 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 finds that 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 non-exhaustive list of circumstances which, 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 Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's MUSCLEPHARM trademark in its entirety together with the geographical term "Europe". Given the nature of the disputed domain name and the manner in which it was used, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark rights when registering the disputed domain name.

The evidence further shows that the disputed domain name resolved to a website displaying the Complainant's MUSCLEPHARM branding and offering purported MUSCLEPHARM-branded products for sale. The website reproduced the Complainant's branding and product offerings in a manner that suggested a connection with the Complainant.

The record further supports a finding that the disputed domain name was used to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the associated website and the products offered through it. The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

UDRP panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, including passing off or other forms of fraud, constitutes evidence of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.1.4 and 3.4.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <musclepharmeuropa.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Douglas Clark/

Douglas Clark

Sole Panelist

Date: August 14, 2026