

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

MGTM Holdings LLC v. clickbank daddy

Case No. D2026-3809

### **1. The Parties**

Complainant is MGTM Holdings LLC, United States of America ("United States" or "U.S."), represented by Greenberg Glusker Fields Claman & Machtinger LLP, United States.

Respondent is clickbank daddy, United States.

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

The Disputed Domain Name <eng-medvi.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 25, 2026. On August 26, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On August 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 (John Doe) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on September 3, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on September 7, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 27, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on September 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Colin T. O'Brien as the sole panelist in this matter on October 1, 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**

Complainant is a provider of brand name and compounded GLP-1 weight loss solutions, among other things. Complainant operates as a telehealth platform providing patients with remote medical care through a streamlined online intake process reviewed and approved by licensed healthcare professionals. Complainant offers its services under the MEDVI mark and through the <medvi.com> website. Complainant has been in operation since July 2024.

Complainant has a pending United States trademark application for MEDVI (Ser. No. 99817840, Filed May 12, 2025) for “pharmaceutical preparations for long term weight management and weight reduction; compounded medications for long term weight management and weight reduction; Pharmaceuticals for the treatment of erectile dysfunction; medicated hair growth stimulants; synthetic peptides for pharmaceutical purposes; dietary and nutritional supplements; hormone replacement therapy preparations; medicated skin care preparations” with a first use date of July 2024.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on December 11, 2025.

#### **5. Parties’ Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

Notably, Complainant contends that Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Name for the purpose of fraudulently impersonating Complainant. Both the Disputed Domain Name and the content of the website operated under the Disputed Domain Name are designed to deliberately mislead consumers into falsely believing that the website is maintained, affiliated with, or endorsed by Complainant and sells Complainant’s products.

The Disputed Domain Name <eng-medvi.com> registered by Respondent, incorporates the MEDVI Mark and is confusingly similar to the MEDVI Mark.

Complainant is informed and believes that Respondent is not known by and has never been known by the Disputed Domain Name nor ever had any independent intellectual property rights relating to the Domain Name.

Complainant is informed and believes that Respondent has not used, nor made preparations to use, the Disputed Domain Name in connection with any bona fide offering of goods and services. Respondent’s use of the Disputed Domain Name is intended solely to create a false impression that Respondent is MEDVI. Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name to perpetuate fraud against unsuspecting consumers by using the strong recognition and good reputation of the Mark for selling counterfeit pharmaceuticals.

It is clear from Respondent’s use of the Disputed Domain Name that it is intended to fraudulently induce unsuspecting consumers to provide their sensitive personal and health information to Respondent under the false belief that they are providing it to Complainant.

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

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

## 6. Discussion and Findings

### A. Identical of Confusingly Similar

Complainant has demonstrated it owns common law trademark rights in the MEDVI mark. The Disputed Domain Name reproduces Complainant's mark in its entirety with the term "eng-" which is a common abbreviation for English. The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

The Panel finds the addition of the "eng-" 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.

Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the mark in which Complainant has rights and the first element of the Policy is established.

### B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Complainant has presented a prima facie case that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name and has not been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. The fact that Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name which incorporates Complainant's common law MEDVI trademark and merely adds the geographically descriptive term "eng-", indicates to the Panel that Respondent likely sought to impersonate Complainant and piggyback on the mark for potential illegitimate purposes.

After a complainant has made a prima facie case, the burden of production shifts to a respondent to present evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. See, e.g., *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0455](#) and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Here, Respondent has failed to participate in the proceedings and as such, it did not provide any evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the nature of the Disputed Domain Name carries a risk of an implied affiliation as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by Complainant. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

In the absence of any evidence rebutting Complainant's prima facie case indicating Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

### C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Disputed Domain Name was registered after Complainant first used the MEDVI mark. The evidence on the record provided by Complainant is sufficient to satisfy the Panel that while its use of the MEDVI mark was relatively recent it had become well-known at the time the Disputed Domain Name was registered, Respondent undoubtedly knew of Complainant's MEDVI mark.

Further, the Panel finds the use of the Disputed Domain Name by Respondent is in bad faith. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy states that evidence of bad faith may include a respondent's use of a domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the respondent's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark. Having the Disputed Domain Name, which incorporates the Complainant's trademark resolve to a website which mimics the Complainant's website indicates to the Panel that Respondent registered and used the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

In the absence of any evidence or explanation from Respondent, the Panel finds that the registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name have been for bad faith purposes.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied 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 <eng-medvi.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Colin T. O'Brien/*

**Colin T. O'Brien**

Sole Panelist

Date: October 14, 2026