

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

MIMEDX Group, Inc. v. Mimedx Service
Case No. D2026-3834

1. The Parties

Complainant is MIMEDX Group, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Sperry IP Law LLC dba Vivid IP, United States.

Respondent is Mimedx Service, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mimedxcorp.com> (hereinafter “Disputed Domain Name”) 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 26, 2026. On August 27, 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 (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on August 28, 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 2, 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 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 23, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on September 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Lawrence K. Nodine as the sole panelist in this matter on September 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

For over a decade, Complainant has used the trademark MIMEDX (hereinafter sometimes the “Mark”) in connection with the development, manufacture and marketing of biomedical products including surgical and wound care products and regenerative therapies. Complainant owns the domain name <mimedx.com>, which resolves to a website where Complainant publishes information about its products and services.

Complainant owns trademark registrations for the Mark in several jurisdictions, including:

- European Union Registration No. 015992191(Registered March 20, 2017); and
- United States Registration No. 5,213,002 (registered May 30, 2017)

The Disputed Domain Name, which was registered on April 22, 2026, resolves to a parked webpage.

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.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not respond to the Complaint.

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.

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.

The entirety of the Mark is reproduced and recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name. Although the addition of other terms may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of “corp” 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 for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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 a 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. Respondent has not rebutted 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. Although the Panel notes that Respondent is identified as “Mimedx Service”, which could potentially give rise to a claim that Respondent would be known by the Disputed Domain Name, Respondent has neither advanced such a claim nor has produced any evidence in this regard. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.3.

Furthermore, the Panel finds that the composition of the Disputed Domain Name carries a risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

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 Panel finds that Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith. The Panel finds that the Mark is distinctive. Respondent has not offered a benign explanation for its registration of the Disputed Domain Name. Neither has it offered any evidence that “mimedx” has any dictionary or other non-trademark meaning. Furthermore, the addition of “corp” indicates that Respondent intended that Internet users associate the Disputed Domain Name with a corporation and, based on the balance of probabilities, the Panel finds that Complainant was the corporation that Respondent had in mind. Accordingly, the Panel finds that when Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name it was aware of and intended in bad faith to target the Mark.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or “coming soon” page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. On the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness of Complainant’s Mark, and the composition of the Disputed Domain Name including the addition of “corp,” and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the Disputed Domain Name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that 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 <mimedxcorp.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Lawrence K. Nodine/

Lawrence K. Nodine

Sole Panelist

Date: October 2, 2026