

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Anthropic, PBC v. Elke Qin
Case No. DCC2025-0017

1. The Parties

Complainant is Anthropic, PBC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Elster & McGrady LLC, United States.

Respondent is Elke Qin, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The Disputed Domain Name <claudecode.cc> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 7, 2025. On August 8, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On August 8, 2025, 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 (Redacted for Privacy Purposes / Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on August 11, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on August 21, 2025.

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 11, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on September 12, 2025.

The Center appointed Richard W. Page as the sole panelist in this matter on September 18, 2025. 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 leading artificial intelligence (AI) safety and research company focused on building reliable, interpretable, and steerable AI systems. Complainant uses its website at <anthropic.com> (registered on October 2, 2001) to publish, without limitation, its documentation, research, and information.

As part of its mission to build safe and reliable models, Complainant has developed a family of large language models (LLMs) named Claude. The first Claude model was released in March 2023. Following the original release of Claude, Complainant garnered significant attention, including from Amazon, which invested an initial USD 4 billion in Complainant. On February 24, 2025, Complainant announced its new command line tool for agentic coding, named Claude Code. Claude Code enables developers to delegate substantial engineering tasks to Complainant's Claude model directly from their terminals. The most recent Claude model, Claude Opus 4.1, was released on August 5, 2025. The Claude model family is globally available in at least 175 countries. Complainant provides access to its Claude model at "https://claude.ai/".

Complainant owns the trademark CLAUDE (the "CLAUDE Mark"), including United States Trademark Registration No. 7645254 applied of February 10, 2023 and registered on January 7, 2025, in international class 42: in connection with "[p]roviding temporary use of on-line non-downloadable software that includes, accesses, uses, and interacts with an artificial intelligence model to perform generative text AI tasks and natural language processing AI tasks and to produce written content based on a theme, text summaries, document question-answering, and natural conversation simulation; application service provider featuring application programming interface (API) software for performing generative text AI tasks and natural language processing AI task and for writing content based on a theme, summarizing text, document question-answering and simulating natural conversations; software as a service (SAAS) featuring software using artificial intelligence for performing generative text AI tasks and natural language processing AI tasks and for writing content based on a theme, summarizing text, document question-answering and simulating natural conversations". Annex 8, trademark registration certificate.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on February 25, 2025 and resolves to a website which displays, alternately, pornography and false malware warnings, which then prompt Internet users to download purported "antivirus software." The website also uses Complainant's brown and orange branding and its YouTube marketing video explaining Claude AI. In addition, the website also provides identical AI chat services to those offered by Complainant.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has rights in the CLAUDE Mark and that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the CLAUDE Mark.

Complainant further contends that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar because it contains the entirety of the CLAUDE Mark with the addition of the industry-specific term "code." Complainant further contends that the use of the country code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".cc" is not to be considered in the analysis of confusing similarity.

Complainant asserts that the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website which displays, alternately, pornography and false malware warnings, which then prompt Internet users to download purported “antivirus software.” Complainant further asserts that such uses are neither bona fide nor legitimate.

Complainant further asserts that Respondent’s webpage impersonates Complainant, because it uses Complainant’s brown and orange branding and Complainant’s YouTube marketing video explaining Claude AI. Complainant further asserts that Respondent’s website also provides identical AI chat services to those offered by Complainant.

Complainant further asserts that Respondent is not a licensee, or in any other way authorized to use the CLAUDE Mark and is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name.

Complainant alleges that Respondent has registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith, because as stated above the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a webpage that impersonates Complainant. Complainant further alleges that Respondent’s website exhibits other rotating content, which includes at times, pornography and false malware warnings.

Complainant further alleges that Respondent is attracting Internet users to its website in violation of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy which constitutes bad faith.

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 reply to Complainant’s contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs the Panel as to the principles the Panel is to use in determining the dispute: “A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules, and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.”

Even though Respondent has failed to file a Response or to contest Complainant’s assertions, the Panel will review the evidence proffered by Complainant to verify that the three essential elements of the claims are met. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 4.3.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that Complainant must prove each of the following three essential elements:

- i) that the Disputed Domain Name registered by Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to the CLAUDE Mark in which Complainant has rights; and,
- ii) that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name; and,
- iii) that the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

[WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1 states that registration is prima facie evidence of Complainant having enforceable rights in the CLAUDE Mark.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of the CLAUDE Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

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 CLAUDE Mark and the Disputed Domain Name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The entirety of the CLAUDE Mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the CLAUDE Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here “code,” may bear on assessment of the second and third essential elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the CLAUDE Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel finds the first essential 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.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy allows three nonexclusive methods for the Panel to conclude that Respondent has rights or a legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name:

- (i) before any notice to you [Respondent] of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Disputed Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) you [Respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) you [Respondent] are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the CLAUDE Mark.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on Complainant, panels have recognized that proving Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name may result in the difficult task of “proving a negative”, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of Respondent. As such, where Complainant makes out a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name (although the burden of proof always remains on Complainant). If Respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, Complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second essential element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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.

Panels have held that the use of the Disputed Domain Name for illegitimate activity, here pornography and distributing malware, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on Respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets forth four nonexclusive criteria for Complainant to show bad faith registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name:

- (i) circumstances indicating that you [Respondent] have registered or you have acquired the Disputed Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Disputed Domain Name registration to Complainant who is the owner of the CLAUDE Mark or to a competitor of Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the Disputed Domain Name; or
- (ii) you [Respondent] have registered the Disputed Domain Name in order to prevent Complainant, as owner of the CLAUDE Mark, from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) you [Respondent] have registered the Disputed Domain Name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) by using the Disputed Domain Name, you [Respondent] have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the CLAUDE Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product on your website or location.

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 the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that Respondent violated paragraph 4(b)(iv) by intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with CLAUDE Mark.

Panels have held that the use of the Disputed Domain Name for illegitimate activity, here pornography and distributing malware, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that Complainant has established the third essential 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 <claudecode.cc> be transferred to Complainant.

/Richard W. Page/

Richard W. Page

Sole Panelist

Date: September 26, 2025