

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Calibrium AG, C Partners Holding GmbH v. Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC
Case No. DCO2026-0055

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Calibrium AG and C Partners Holding GmbH, Switzerland, represented by Niederer Kraft & Frey Ltd, Switzerland.

The Respondent is Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC, Saint Kitts and Nevis.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <calibrium-ag.co> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 16, 2026. On July 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On July 17, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 21, 2026, 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 amendment to the Complaint on July 21, 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 14, 2026.

The Center appointed Mariia Koval as the sole panelist in this matter on August 20, 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

The Complainant (previously known as aeris CAPITAL Holding GmbH), founded in 2006 and rebranded in 2017, is a private investment office based in Zurich, Switzerland. The Complainant offers financial solutions and solutions related to private equity and venture capital investments.

The Complainant is the owner of a number of CALIBRIUM trademark registrations (the “CALIBRIUM Trademark”) throughout the world, among which are:

- International Trademark Registration No. 1336554, registered on December 13, 2016, in respect of services in class 36;
- United States of America Registration No. 5278989, registered on September 5, 2017, in respect of services in class 36;
- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00801348832, registered on November 10, 2017, in respect of services in class 36.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on July 1, 2026. As at the dates of filing of the Complaint and this Decision, the Disputed Domain Name resolves to an inactive website.

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 the Complainant's CALIBRIUM Trademark since the Disputed Domain Name reproduces the Complainant's CALIBRIUM Trademark in its entirety. The addition of the Complainant's legal form “AG” does nothing to distinguish the Disputed Domain Name from the Complainant's CALIBRIUM Trademark; on the contrary, it reinforces an impression that the Disputed Domain Name is connected to the Complainant.

The Complainant further claims that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name in view of the following:

- there is no evidence of any bona fide use by the Respondent of the Disputed Domain Name since the Disputed Domain Name does not resolve to an active website;
- by reproducing the Complainant's well-known and highly distinctive CALIBRIUM Trademark in its entirety, the Respondent intends to mislead internet users by falsely suggesting an affiliation with or endorsement by the Complainant;
- the Respondent does not appear to be commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name;
- The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized to use its CALIBRIUM Trademark in any form;

- the Respondent reproduces the Complainant's CALIBRIUM Trademark in its entirety and
- without alteration, which improperly and falsely implies an affiliation between the Respondent and the Complainant.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith based on the following. The Disputed Domain Name reproduces the well-known CALIBRIUM Trademark in its entirety, with the additions of the Complainant's own legal form "AG" and the Second-Level Domain and the country code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".co". The Complainant's rights in the CALIBRIUM Trademark date back to 2016 (and earlier), whereas the Disputed Domain Name has been registered only recently in 2026, well after the CALIBRIUM Trademark was commercially established. Given the Complainant's reputation in the financial industry and the widespread recognition of the CALIBRIUM Trademark, the Respondent would have been aware that they were registering the Disputed Domain Name that is confusingly similar to the distinctive CALIBRIUM Trademark.

As has been held by the panel in case, *See Calibrium AG, C Partners Holding GmbH v. Richard Hoffmann (previously Agron Elezaj)*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-0186](#), the Complainant's CALIBRIUM Trademark is well-known. In light of the global reputation and widespread recognition of the Complainant's CALIBRIUM Trademark, the Respondent cannot credibly claim to have been unaware of the CALIBRIUM Trademark at the time of registering the Disputed Domain Name. Furthermore, the Complainant's CALIBRIUM Trademark is highly distinctive with no obvious descriptive meaning, making it implausible that anyone would independently come up with the identical name by coincidence.

Furthermore, Complainant contends that there is no conceivable plausible actual or contemplated active use of the Disputed Domain Name that is not illegitimate. Any conceivable active use by the Respondent would involve the impersonation of the Complainant, confusion of internet users, or other illegitimate exploitation of the CALIBRIUM Trademark. In this context it must be recalled that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests and is deliberately targeting the Complainant's well-established CALIBRIUM Trademark in a malicious case of cybersquatting by registering the CALIBRIUM Trademark abusive Disputed Domain Name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which complainant has rights;
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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.

The 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 Disputed Domain Name completely reproduces the Complainant's CALIBRIUM Trademark in combination with the hyphen, word "ag" and the "ccTLD" ".co". According to [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8, where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. In this case, the addition of the term "ag" (potentially an abbreviation of the Complainant's legal form "Aktiengesellschaft") to the CALIBRIUM Trademark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Pursuant to [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7, in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, the domain name will normally be considered identical or confusingly similar to that mark for purposes of UDRP standing.

According to the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11, the applicable gTLD in a domain name (e.g., ".com", ".club", ".nyc") is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

Furthermore, the use of hyphen in the Disputed Domain Name is irrelevant in a finding of confusing similarity as the CALIBRIUM Trademark is recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's CALIBRIUM Trademark pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

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 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 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 or otherwise.

The Panel concludes that there is no relation, disclosed to the Panel or otherwise apparent from the record, between the Respondent and the Complainant. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor has the Respondent otherwise obtained an authorization to use the Complainant's CALIBRIUM Trademark. Moreover, there is no element from which the Panel could infer the Respondent's rights over the Disputed Domain Name, or that the Respondent might be commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name.

In accordance with [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1, even where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term, UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. The composition of the Disputed Domain Name – reproducing the entirety of the CALIBRIUM Trademark, along with the hyphen and term “ag” – carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant.

There is also no evidence that the Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name to offer bona fide goods and services or making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name. On the contrary, as of the dates of the Complaint and this Decision the Disputed Domain Name resolves to an inactive website.

The Respondent did not file any response to the Complaint and did not participate in these proceedings, as such, the Respondent did not present any evidence supporting any rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

Accordingly, 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 concludes that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith in view of the following. The Complainant obtained the registration of the CALIBRIUM Trademark 10 years earlier than the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name in 2026. Taking into account all circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant's business and its CALIBRIUM Trademark when registering the confusingly similar Disputed Domain Name that completely incorporates the Complainant's CALIBRIUM Trademark. The addition of the term “ag” (which could refer to the legal form of the Complainant in German) to the Complainant's CALIBRIUM Trademark in the Disputed Domain Name, is further evidence, that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant's INSTAGRAM Trademark and business at the time of registration of the Disputed Domain Name and has done so for the only purpose of creating an impression that the Disputed Domain Name and the website are connected with the Complainant's CALIBRIUM Trademark. The Panel considers it is obviously bad faith that the Respondent deliberately chose the Disputed Domain Name to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's CALIBRIUM Trademark.

Prior UDRP panels have recognized that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can itself create a presumption of bad faith (see section 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), which states that “the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain name comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith”). The Complainant has filed evidence of the well-known character of its prior CALIBRIUM Trademark and it has been stated above that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the CALIBRIUM Trademark.

Moreover, while the Disputed Domain Name resolves to inactive website, it has been established that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Given the Complainant's well-reported involvement and reputation in the investment, and the composition of the Disputed Domain Name, such passive holding does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

Finally, the Respondent, not participating in the proceeding, has failed to indicate any facts and/or evidence which would show the good faith registration or use of the Disputed Domain Name.

In view of the foregoing, the Panel finds that the paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy has been satisfied by the Complainant and accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 <calibrium-ag.co> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mariia Koval/

Mariia Koval

Sole Panelist

Date: September 3, 2026