ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
OTCX Trading Limited v. Sandro Maruani
Case No. D2026-3709

1. The Parties

The Complainant is OTCX Trading Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Spencer West LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Sandro Maruani, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <otcx.pro> (the "Domain Name") is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 19, 2026. On August 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On August 21, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 25, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint.

On August 25, 2026, the Respondent sent an email communication to the Center, stating that they consent to the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant. On September 2, 2026, the proceedings were suspended for settlement purposes until October 2, 2026. On October 1, 2026, the Complainant requested that the proceedings be reinstated. The proceeding was reinstituted on October 2, 2026, and the Complainant filed an amended Complaint on October 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 October 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 26, 2026. On October 7, 2026, the Respondent sent a further communication to the Center. The Complainant responded on October 7, 2026, requesting that the proceedings continue. The Center commenced the panel appointment process on October 27, 2026.

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on November 2, 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 to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant operates a platform for the trading of derivatives and other financial products. The Complainant was formed in 2014 and is the owner of the OTCX trademark. The Complainant has been operating the domain name <otcxtrading.com> for its website since August 25, 2015.

The Complainant holds trademark registrations of OTCX, such as European Union trademark registration number 017981045 registered on March 21, 2019.

The Domain Name was registered on December 5, 2025, after the Complainant's registered trademark rights. The Domain Name has resolved to a website with a header "OTCX" in the top-left corner, and which appears to be a platform which offers trading of cryptocurrency tokens.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant provides evidence of trademark registrations. The Complainant argues that the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. The Second-Level Domain OTCX is identical to the Complainant's registered trademark.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not authorized to use the Complainant's trademark, and the Respondent is not commonly known by the Domain Name. The Complainant is the only company known by the mark OTCX globally. The term "OTCX" is a distinctive mark with no inherent meaning. The textual component "OTCX", is an invented, distinctive mark that has no dictionary meaning in any language. It has no valid or logical commercial utility other than in connection with the Complainant's trademark. The Respondent's use of the Domain Name does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The Respondent is actively using the domain to intercept and divert Internet users who are seeking the Complainant.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract for commercial or other gain users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. The Respondent knew or should have known of the OTCX trademark and the Complainant's website. The Complainant argues that it is highly unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant when it registered the Domain Name. The Complainant's trademark is highly distinctive and well known within its industry.

B. Respondent

The Respondent sent an informal communication to the Center on August 25, 2026, stating that "I am the registrant of the disputed domain name. Without any admission of liability, bad faith, or of the merits of the Complaint, and without prejudice to any of my rights, I hereby consent to the transfer of the domain name

<otcx.pro> to the Complainant". The Respondent sent another communication on October 7, 2026, largely reiterating the above, and inquiring with the Complainant regarding compensation to rebrand and migrate the project.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Issues

As the Respondent while consenting to the transfer has disclaimed bad faith, the Panel finds it appropriate to proceed to a substantive decision on the merits, see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.10.

6.2. Substantive Issues

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the Domain Name. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The Complainant has documented registered trademarks. The Domain Name is identical to the Complainant's trademark OTCX. For the purpose of assessing the identity or confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel ignores the generic Top-Level Domain. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, 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.

While 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 often impossible 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 (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Based on the record, the Respondent is not affiliated or related to the Complainant. There is no evidence that the Respondent has registered the Domain Name as a trademark or acquired trademark rights. There is no evidence of the Respondent's use of the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Furthermore, the Panel finds that the nature of the Domain Name, which is identical to the Complainant's trademark, carries a high risk of implied affiliation. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

Based on the available record, 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 composition and use of the Domain Name make it clear that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant when the Respondent registered the Domain Name. The Complainant's trademark is distinctive, the Parties both broadly operate within the financial industry, and the Respondent has failed to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use or otherwise substantively dispute the Complainant's claims. The use of the Domain Name also serves as evidence of bad faith use under the Policy. The Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract for commercial gain users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website.

For the reasons set out above, the Panel concludes that the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. The third element of the Policy has been established.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders the Domain Name <otcx.pro> transferred to the Complainant.

/Mathias Lilleengen/
Mathias Lilleengen
Sole Panelist
Date: November 6, 2026