

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

YCX, LLC and Y Combinator Management, LLC v. Gray Turner, Hypercortex Case No. DCO2026-0030

1. The Parties

Complainants are YCX, LLC, United States of America (“United States”) and Y Combinator Management, LLC, United States, represented internally.

Respondent is Gray Turner, Hypercortex, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ycombinator.com.co> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 23, 2026. On March 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On March 25, 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 and contact information in the Complaint. The Center requested the Complaint to be amended on March 26, April 2 and 10, 2026. Complainant sent amended Complaints on April 3 and 14, 2026. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on April 15, 2026, 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 April 17, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 10, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on May 15, 2026.

The Center appointed Kimberley Chen Nobles as the sole panelist in this matter on May 22, 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

First co-Complainant YCX, LLC ("YCX") is the owner and sole member of second co-Complainant Y Combinator Management, LLC (collectively referred to as "Complainant"). Second co-Complainant Y Combinator is a startup accelerator based in Mountain View, California, United States, having funded and supported startups since 2005, including companies such as Airbnb, Dropbox, Stripe, Reddit, and DoorDash. Second co-Complainant operates the website at <ycombinator.com>. First co-Complainant owns United States registered trademark number 4995814 for the Y COMBINATOR word mark, registered on July 12, 2016, with a first use date of June 17, 2005. The Y COMBINATOR mark is used in connection with startup accelerator services, funding and investment services, and related support, educational and networking services for entrepreneurs and startups.

The Domain Name was registered on September 2, 2025, and was configured with email capabilities to send email communications to second co-Complainant's business partners by impersonating second co-Complainant, in an attempt to fraudulently obtain services and credits by claiming affiliation with second co-Complainant.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

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

Notably, Complainants contend that (i) the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark; (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

In particular, Complainant contends that it has trademark rights for Y COMBINATOR and that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name, with the intention to confuse Internet users looking for bona fide Y COMBINATOR services.

Complainant notes that it has no affiliation with Respondent, nor authorized Respondent to register or use a domain name which includes Complainant's trademark, and that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the registration and use of the Domain Name. Rather, Complainant contends that Respondent has acted in bad faith in acquiring and setting up the Domain Name, when Respondent clearly knew of Complainant's rights.

Specifically, Complainant argues that Respondent used the Domain Name to set up email services to send fraudulent phishing communications to second co-Complainant's business partners, impersonating second co-Complainant, to fraudulently obtain credits, services and benefits reserved for legitimate participants.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)") states that failure to respond to complainant's contentions would not by itself mean that complainant is deemed to have prevailed; a respondent's default is not necessarily an admission that complainant's claims are true.

Thus, although in this case Respondent has failed to respond to the Complaint, the burden remains with Complainant to establish the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy by a preponderance of the evidence.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Complainant has provided evidence of its rights in the Y COMBINATOR trademark, as noted above. Complainant has therefore proven that it has the requisite rights in the Y COMBINATOR trademark.

With Complainant's rights in the Y COMBINATOR mark established, the remaining question under the first element of the Policy is whether the Domain Name, typically disregarding the Top-Level Domain ("TLD") in which it was registered (in this case, ".com.co"), is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark. See, e.g., *B & H Foto & Electronics Corp. v. Domains by Proxy, Inc. / Joseph Gross*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-0842](#).

As prior panels have recognized, incorporating a trademark in its entirety in a domain name is generally sufficient to establish that a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a complainant's mark for purposes of the Policy. In the current situation, the Domain Name incorporates Complainant's Y COMBINATOR trademark in its entirety. The Y COMBINATOR mark is recognizable within the Domain Name. Accordingly, the Domain Name is identical to Complainant's Y COMBINATOR trademark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Thus, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied the first element of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, a complainant must make a prima facie showing that a respondent possesses no rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. See, e.g., *Malayan Banking Berhad v. Beauty, Success & Truth International*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-1393](#). Once a complainant makes such a prima facie showing, the burden of production shifts to respondent, though the burden of proof always remains on complainant. If respondent fails to come forward with relevant evidence showing rights or legitimate interests, complainant will have sustained its burden under the second element of the UDRP.

From the record in this case, it is evident that Respondent was, and is, aware of Complainant and its Y COMBINATOR trademark and does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Complainant has confirmed that Respondent is not affiliated with Complainant, or otherwise authorized or

licensed to use the Y COMBINATOR trademark or to seek registration of any domain name incorporating this trademark. Respondent is also not known to be associated with the Y COMBINATOR trademark and there is no evidence showing that Respondent has been commonly known by the Domain Name.

In addition, Respondent has not used the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Rather, the record shows that Respondent had used the Domain Name to engage in illegal activity, namely, the sending of phishing communications to second co-Complainant's business partners, impersonating second co-Complainant's, to fraudulently obtain credits, services and benefits reserved for legitimate participants of second co-Complainant's programs.

UDRP panels have consistently held that use of a domain name for illegal activity — such as email phishing, impersonation, or passing off — can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Furthermore, UDRP panels have found that domain names identical to a complainant's trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Accordingly, Complainant has provided evidence supporting its prima facie showing that Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Respondent has failed to produce countervailing evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Thus, the Panel concludes that Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name and Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that Respondent's actions indicate that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances indicating bad faith registration and use on the part of a respondent, namely:

“(i) circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) you have registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, you 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 complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product or service on your website or location.”

The Panel finds that Complainant has provided ample evidence to show that its registration and use of the Y COMBINATOR trademark predates the registration of the Domain Name. Complainant is also well established and known; indeed, the record shows that Complainant's Y COMBINATOR trademark and related services are known and recognized for purposes of the Policy. In addition, second co-Complainant owns and operates the domain name <ycombinator.com>. Therefore, and also noting the use analysis below, Respondent was clearly aware of the Y COMBINATOR trademark when it registered the Domain Name.

The Panel therefore finds that Respondent's awareness of Complainant's trademark rights at the time of registration suggests bad faith. See *Red Bull GmbH v. Credit du Léman SA, Jean-Denis Deletraz*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-2209](#); *Nintendo of America Inc v. Marco Beijen, Beijen Consulting, Pokemon Fan Clubs Org., and Pokemon Fans Unite*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-1070](#); and *BellSouth Intellectual Property Corporation v. Serena, Axel*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0007](#).

As noted above, the record shows that Respondent had used the Domain Name to engage in illegal activity, namely, the sending of phishing communications to second co-Complainant's business partners, impersonating second co-Complainant. In particular, Respondent has used the Domain Name to contact second co-Complainant's business and program partners, falsely claiming affiliation with second co-Complainant, in an attempt to fraudulently obtain such credits, services and benefits reserved for participants of second co-Complainant's programs. Second co-Complainant's business partners noticed such fraudulent attempts and reported them to second co-Complainant.

UDRP panels have consistently held that a respondent's use of a domain name to trade off goodwill in a complainant's well-known trademark and impersonate complainant, as here, constitutes bad faith. See *Philip Morris Products S.A. v. homn mohmoodi*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-4158](#). Moreover, such use of the Domain Name may potentially result in tarnishing Complainant's reputation and goodwill.

Finally, the Panel also notes the failure of Respondent to submit a response. In the present circumstances, considering the reputation of the Y COMBINATOR trademark and Respondent's use of the Domain Name, the Panel finds that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

Therefore, the Panel finds that Complainant succeeds under the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 Domain Name <ycombinator.com.co> be transferred to Complainant.

/Kimberley Chen Nobles/

Kimberley Chen Nobles

Sole Panelist

Date: May 29, 2026