

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Stripe, Inc. v. Martin Green, Stripe option
Case No. DCO2025-0031

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Stripe, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Elster & McGrady LLC, United States.

The Respondent is Martin Green, Stripe option, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <stripeoption.co> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 21, 2025. On March 21, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 21, 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 / Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 27, 2025, 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 amended Complaint on April 1, 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 3, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 23, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 2, 2025.

The Center appointed W. Scott Blackmer as the sole panelist in this matter on May 7, 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

The Complainant is a financial services corporation established under the laws of the State of Delaware, United States, with headquarters in South San Francisco, California, United States. The Complainant operates a leading online payment system used by millions of businesses in over 40 countries (including the United States, United Kingdom, and Cyprus). The Complainant markets its services online and in other channels, and the Complainant and its customers use the Complainant's website at "www.stripe.com", among other things, to publish its documentation, libraries, and API resources. The Complainant's payment service is widely known, as it is used by such ecommerce giants as Amazon, Shopify, and Google.

The Complainant holds trademark registrations for STRIPE including the following:

Mark	Jurisdiction	Registration Number	Registration Date	Goods or Services
STRIPE (word)	United States	4451679	December 17, 2013	International Class 36
STRIPE (word)	Colombia	602744	September 14, 2018	International Classes 35, 36, 42
STRIPE (word)	United Kingdom	UK00003534722	January 8, 2021	International Classes 9, 36, 42

The disputed domain name was created on January 20, 2023, and registered to the Respondent Martin Green, showing his organization as "Stripe option" with a postal address in the State of Washington, United States, and a Gmail contact email address. The Panel notes that the ".co" country code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") is delegated to Colombia but available to registrants regardless of citizenship and is often used to signify a corporate domain name because "co" is also a common abbreviation for "company".

At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to a landing page with a warning that the associated website has been reported for suspected phishing. Ignoring that warning produces a "Not Found" message. However, the Complaint attaches screenshots of the Respondent's former website, and archived screenshots are available from the Internet Archive's Wayback Machine. These show how the Respondent's website appeared in early 2025, with many hallmarks of fraud. The Respondent's website purported to be an international "investment platform" founded in 2015, with tens of thousands of individual traders in stocks, digital currencies, foreign exchange, and other assets. The copyright notice was dated 2020, before the disputed domain name was even created. The "About Us" page made the kind of generic statements about company values that can be produced readily by artificial intelligence but did not identify any officers, offer any company history, or indicate whether and how the company is regulated by any financial services supervisory authority. Under "Weekly Payouts", the site listed "top paid investors" by their first names and how much they have been paid in Bitcoin. The site included unnaturally worded comments such as this one, ostensibly from a man named Schmidt in Paris, France: "I'm kicking myself for not putting in more capital into her best strategy used in earning on my behalf." The site listed a postal address in Cyprus but claimed that Stripe Option is "one of the world's leading independent branded companies" (a vague and obviously exaggerated claim) and is "headquartered in United Kingdom" (giving no address), with offices in "five countries" (not named). The Panel finds no record of a "Stripe Option" company listed on the United Kingdom's official Companies House database or the online database of registered companies in Cyprus operated by its Registrar of Companies and Intellectual Property.¹ Significantly, the Respondent's website

¹Noting the general powers of a panel articulated in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it is commonly accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record, as the Panel has done in this proceeding. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.8

made the kind of unequivocal guarantee of earnings that no financial regulator (certainly not those of the United Kingdom or Cyprus) would countenance:

“Earn instant top-up everyday on your initial cryptocurrency investment with a minimum of 2.50% daily profit return and earn 200% of your investment after each investment cycle.”

The Respondent’s website solicited contact by site visitors via chat or email, presumably leading to the current phishing warning.

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 the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its registered STRIPE trademark, and that the Respondent does not have permission to use the mark and is not associated in any way with the Complainant. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent Martin Green is not commonly known by a corresponding name, as there is no evidence of a “Stripe Option” company registered to do business in Washington State where the Respondent lists its address in the registration details for the disputed domain name. The Complainant points to the fact that the disputed domain name is currently inactive and argues for the application of the “passive holding” doctrine, based on the strong reputation of the Complainant’s mark, the lack of any actual or contemplated good-faith use, and the Respondent’s active steps to conceal its true identity, “operating as a name that is not a registered business name” and providing false contact details in breach of the registration agreement. The Complainant argues further that the Respondent’s former website was an effort to capitalize on a confusingly similar trademark widely identified with financial services, soliciting investors for commercial gain. The lack of Terms and Conditions or a Privacy section on the Respondent’s former website also indicates that it was not being operated in good faith, as was the effort to collect personal information through the website and the configuration of the disputed domain name for MX records to accommodate emails, which also could be used in a fraud scheme. The Complainant concludes that the improbable “investor” site was designed as part of a phishing scam to collect personal information and defraud site visitors, an example of bad faith not enumerated in paragraph 4 of the Policy but recognized in numerous UDRP proceedings.

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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark, the registered STRIPE word mark, for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, the word “option”) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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.

Although 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 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 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds 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, paragraph 4(c), or otherwise. The Panel finds no evidence of an entity known as “Stripe Option” in Washington State, the United Kingdom, or Cyprus. The screenshots of the Respondent’s former website do not reflect a bona fide offering of goods or services but rather an improbable and likely illegal attempt to solicit personal information and deposits, using the Complainant’s well-known trademark in the financial field as a lure. The Respondent has not come forward to demonstrate a legitimate business activity.

Moreover, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate and illegal activity (here, claimed to be phishing and possibly financial fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Respondent was more likely than not aware of the Complainant and its well-established STRIPE mark. The mark has been in common use in connection with online payment transactions for more than a decade in the United States where the Respondent is located and also for years in the countries where the Respondent’s former website purported to be centered. There is no obvious reason to use the English word “stripe” for a website relating to financial investments, such as the Respondent’s former website, other than to exploit the Complainant’s reputation in financial services. The Panel notes that the Complainant’s reputation is particularly strong in Europe, as the Complainant operates a “second headquarters” in Dublin, Ireland, and the Respondent’s former website claimed a headquarters in the United Kingdom and cited customers in the United Kingdom and elsewhere in Europe. The Respondent’s former website accords with the illustration of bad faith in the Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv),

intentionally attempting to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.²

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels also have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity and illegal activity (here, claimed to be phishing and possibly financial fraud) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the 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 <stripeoption.co> be transferred to the Complainant.

/W. Scott Blackmer/

W. Scott Blackmer

Sole Panelist

Date: May 20, 2025

²The Complainant cites as well the "passive holding" doctrine, given the current inactive status of the disputed domain name. The reputation of the STRIPE mark supports this, but it would be somewhat problematic to argue that there was "no conceivable legitimate use" for a domain name composed with such a dictionary term. In any event, the Respondent's former use of the disputed domain name for a commercial and apparently fraudulent website renders reliance on the passive holding doctrine unnecessary.