ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
EMCD Tech LTD v. Jakovlev Pavel Olegovich
Case No. DME2025-0027

1. The Parties

The Complainant is EMCD Tech LTD, Hong Kong, China, internally represented.

The Respondent is Jakovlev Pavel Olegovich, Russian Federation.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <emcd.me> is registered with RU-CENTER-MSK (Regional Network Information Center, JSC dba RU-CENTER) (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 6, 2025. On October 7, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 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 (Privacy protection service - whoisproxy.ru) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 9, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant did not file an amendment to the Complaint.

On October 9, 2025, the Center informed the Parties in Russian and English that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name was Russian. The Complainant did not explicitly request English to be the language of the proceedings. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the language of proceedings, and on October 9, 2025 sent a communication in English. On October 15 and 23, 2025, the Center again wrote to the Complainant about the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar and about the language of the proceedings. The Complainant did not respond to these communications.

The Center verified that 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 October 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 13, 2025. On October 31, 2025, the Complainant requested suspension of the proceedings for the purposes of settlement discussions. On the same date, the Center suspended the proceedings until November 30, 2025. On December 1, 2025, the Complainant requested the reinstitution of the proceedings. On the same date, the Center reinstituted the proceedings and informed the Parties that the due date for filing a Response was December 14, 2025. The Response was filed in English with the Center on December 14, 2025. On December 14, 2025, both Parties filed supplemental submissions in English.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev as the sole panelist in this matter on December 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

The Complainant describes itself as an entity established in 2019 and acting in the field of cryptocurrency mining, blockchain technology, and data center services, offering a variety of products, including a mining pool, a P2P marketplace, and Coinhold storage wallets. The Complainant claims to be one of the top ten mining pools in the world in terms of the volume of bitcoins mined. The Complainant operates its official website at the domain name <emcd.io>, which serves as a platform for its client base to access services, support, and information.

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registrations for EMCD (the "EMCD trademark"):

− the International trademark  with registration No. 1836317, registered on August 26, 2024, for goods and services in International Classes 9, 35, 36, 38, and 42; and

− the Russian trademark  with registration No. 1059744, registered on November 5, 2024 for goods and services in International Classes 9, 35, 36, 38 and 42.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 10, 2025. At the time of filing of the Complaint, it was inactive. The disputed domain name currently resolves to a static webpage containing information about the European Union Electromagnetic Compatibility Directive 2014/30/EU.[1] According to the text on this webpage, it represents a one-page summary […] distilled from Certify & Comply's article "The Electromagnetic Compatibility Directive (EMCD)".

With its supplemental submission, the Complainant submitted screenshots, which according to it indicate that the disputed domain name has been used in official chat page/resource of the Complainant in connection with cryptocurrency mining pool stratum servers (working mirrors). This allegation is disputed by the Respondent, who maintains that the disputed domain name has only been used in relation to the webpage about the European Union Electromagnetic Compatibility Directive 2014/30/EU ("European Union Directive 2014/30/EU") that is currently associated to it. The conclusions of the Panel on this issue are set out in section 6 below.

[1] Directive 2014/30/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 February 2014 on the harmonisation of the laws of the Member States relating to electromagnetic compatibility (recast). The objective of this Directive is to ensure that electrical and electronic equipment does not generate and is not affected by electromagnetic disturbance.

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.

The Complainant states that in addition to its registered trademark rights it has acquired substantial common law rights in the EMCD trademark through extensive, continuous, and exclusive use in commerce, and that its trademark has gained significant goodwill and reputation, making it well-known in its field.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to its EMCD trademark, because it is a copy of the trademark. The Complainant adds that the ".me" country-code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") should be disregarded for the purpose of assessing identity or confusing similarity under the UDRP.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, because the Complainant has never authorized it to use the EMCD trademark or to register any domain name incorporating it. The Complainant adds that there is no relationship between the Parties, that the Respondent is not commonly known by the name "EMCD", and that the disputed domain name is inactive. According to the Complainant, the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name and is not using it in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to it, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name primarily to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website. According to the Complainant, the Respondent intended to capitalize on the Complainant's goodwill and reputation to drive traffic to its own website, potentially through pay-per-click advertisements, phishing schemes, or by offering competing or inferior services. The Complainant maintains that the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name that is identical to the ECMD trademark is not coincidental and shows that the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant and its rights at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, which took place a significant amount of time after the Complainant registered its EMCD trademark and it gained reputation in the cryptocurrency sector. The Complainant contends that the Respondent's failure to actively use the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith.

With its supplemental submission, the Complainant makes the statements summarized below.

The Complainant notes that the Respondent has not provided any evidence that would confirm the existence of a legitimate, ongoing educational project related to the European Union Electromagnetic Compatibility Directive 2014/30/EU. According to the Complainant, the creation of a placeholder or landing page after the commencement of these proceedings is insufficient and appears to be a tactical move designed to manufacture a defense. The Complainant adds that the Respondent has provided no evidence of his expertise, affiliation, or prior engagement in the highly specialized field of technical European Union regulation.

The Complainant states that it has obtained evidence, demonstrating that the disputed domain name has been associated with an activity within the cryptocurrency industry. According to it, the evidence attached to its supplemental filing indicates that the disputed domain name has been used in official chat page/resource of the Complainant in connection with cryptocurrency mining pool stratum servers (working mirrors).
The Complainant notes that this highly specific technical use is uniquely associated with cryptocurrency mining operations, which is the core business of the Complainant.

The Complainant maintains that, by using the EMCD trademark in the same industry, the Respondent is effectively impersonating the Complainant, which creates a severe risk of consumer confusion, damages the Complainant's reputation, and exposes users to potential fraud or security risks. The Complainant points out that the Respondent's claim of a noncommercial educational website is directly contradicted by the evidence of activity in the commercial cryptocurrency sphere. According to the Complainant, this inconsistency reveals the Respondent's narrative to be unreliable and suggests the educational website claim is a pretext to conceal bad faith registration and use.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has not proven that it carries a legitimate noncommercial use of the disputed domain name, because the claimed use is unsubstantiated and appears fabricated, and adds that the Respondent is not commonly known by the name "emcd" and the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its EMCD trademark. According to the Complainant, the Respondent's argument that "emcd" is a common abbreviation for a European Union Directive 2014/30/EU is irrelevant, and any actual use of the disputed domain name is commercial and directly competitive.

The Complainant maintains that the registration of the disputed domain name identical to a distinctive, well-known mark in a specific industry is prima facie evidence of targeting. According to it, given the fame of the EMCD trademark in the cryptocurrency field, the Respondent's denial of knowledge is implausible. The Complainant adds that the initial passive holding of the disputed domain name, followed by the hasty creation of a purportedly educational website only after the Complaint was filed, is a classic indicator of bad faith.

The Complainant submits that the evidence of association of the disputed domain name with cryptocurrency mining activities (stratum servers) demonstrates that the disputed domain name was and is being used for commercial gain in a manner that capitalizes on the Complainant's goodwill and creates a likelihood of confusion, falling under Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

B. Respondent

The Respondent contends that the Complainant has not satisfied any of the three elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent states that he registered the disputed domain name on April 10, 2025, in good faith for the purpose of creating a noncommercial educational website related to the European Union Directive 2014/30/EU concerning electromagnetic compatibility of electrical and electronic equipment, referred to as the "EMCD". The Respondent states that his project is intended to provide free, informational, and educational content explaining regulatory requirements, compliance principles, and general guidance for engineers, manufacturers, and students. The Respondent states that the website at the disputed domain name is not commercial, contains no advertising, and is entirely unrelated to cryptocurrency, blockchain, mining, finance, or digital assets. The Respondent notes that, following receipt of the Complaint, the Respondent has already published a noncommercial informational landing page at the disputed domain name, describing the educational purpose of the site and its focus on the European Union Directive 2014/30/EU.

The Respondent maintains that he has legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, because it is used for a bona fide, noncommercial educational project explaining European Union regulatory law, without intent for commercial gain. The Respondent states that the disputed domain name reflects the descriptive abbreviation of a public European Union directive, and not the Complainant's brand. The Respondent submits that the content of the website at the disputed domain name clearly indicates its regulatory and educational purpose and does not refer to or imitate the Complainant.

The Respondent states that he registered the disputed domain name independently and without knowledge of the Complainant or its trademarks. According to him, his good faith is evident from the facts that the disputed domain name has never been offered for sale, that there is no pay-per-click advertising or revenue-generating use, no imitation of the Complainant's branding or services, but an actual publication of

noncommercial educational content relating to the European Union electromagnetic compatibility regulation.

As to the Complainant reference to the doctrine of "passive holding", the Respondent submits that its EMCD trademark is not a famous or unique trademark, and the Complainant's trademark registrations do not extend to regulatory education, technical compliance guidance, or informational publications regarding European Union law. The Respondent adds that "emcd" is a neutral abbreviation used long before the Complainant's trademark was applied for registration. According to the Respondent, the Complainant cannot monopolize all uses of these four letters across unrelated fields.

The Respondent notes that there is no overlap in industry (*cryptocurrency v. European Union technical regulation*), audience (*crypto users v. engineers and compliance professionals*), purpose (*commercial v. educational*). According to the Respondent, Internet users would not reasonably assume any association between the website at the disputed domain name and the Complainant.

The Respondent notes that, given the descriptive nature of the disputed domain name, the Respondent's legitimate use, and the lack of trademark rights in the relevant field, the filing of the Complaint appears to be an attempt to obtain a domain name beyond the proper scope of trademark protection. The Respondent requests the Panel to consider a finding of Reverse Domain Name Hijacking ("RDNH").

With its supplemental submission, the Respondent makes the statements summarized below.

According to the Respondent, the assertion of the Complainant that the Respondent failed to provide official documentation, to substantiate a legitimate project is "legally incorrect". Under the Policy, a respondent may establish legitimate interests through legitimate noncommercial or fair use, without any requirement to demonstrate a registered business, commercial activity, tax filings, or operational infrastructure. The Respondent maintains that a bona fide noncommercial educational purpose does not require corporate registration or commercial documentation under the Policy.

The Respondent states that it has already published a public informational landing page at the disputed domain name describing the noncommercial educational purpose of the website and its focus on the European Union Directive 2014/30/EU, which directly contradicts the Complainant's assertion that no project exists.

According to the Respondent, the claim of the Complainant that the disputed domain name was used as a "stratum server" or "working mirror" associated with cryptocurrency mining operations is factually incorrect and unsupported. The Respondent maintains that no stratum server, mining mirror, or cryptocurrency-related service has ever been hosted or operated by the Respondent at the disputed domain name or any of its subdomains. The Respondent states that he has never configured, deployed, or authorized any infrastructure related to cryptocurrency mining. According to the Respondent, the Complainant's allegations rely solely on screenshots from unidentified private chat communications, which do not demonstrate the existence of a server, any hosting activity, a DNS configuration specific to mining, or any control by the Respondent. The Respondent adds that private third-party statements are not technical evidence of domain name use.

The Respondent explains that the disputed domain name is configured with a standard wildcard DNS record ("*"), meaning that any arbitrary subdomain resolves to the same IP address. The Respondent states that this technical configuration is neutral and commonly used, does not create or indicate a functional service, and does not evidence intent or use in cryptocurrency activities. According to the Respondent, the fact that a DNS query resolves, does not show "use" under the Policy and does not establish bad faith. The Respondent maintains that the Complainant has failed to provide any verifiable evidence showing that the Respondent has operated a cryptocurrency service, hosted mining infrastructure, generated traffic, monetized the disputed domain name, or intended to exploit the Complainant's goodwill.

The Respondent concludes that the Complainant's additional submission relies on speculative interpretations of third-party communications and a misunderstanding of basic DNS functionality.

The Respondent submits that these materials do not demonstrate registration or use of the disputed domain name in bad faith and do not alter the Respondent's legitimate noncommercial interest in it.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural issue - Language of the Proceedings

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Russian. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the Parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceedings shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Respondent did not make any specific submissions with respect to the language of the proceedings, and submitted the Response and all its additional email communications only in English.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.0"), section 4.5.1).

As the Respondent has filed all its submissions and communications in English and has not requested a Russian translation of the Complaint and/or of the attached evidence, the Panel considers that the Respondent has a good command of English and would not suffer a prejudice if the proceedings are carried out in this language. In these circumstances, it appears that the use of English as the language of the proceeding would contribute to its efficiency and save time and costs.

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceedings shall be English.

6.2. Procedural issue – Supplemental submissions

Both Parties in these proceedings have submitted supplemental submissions.

Having reviewed them together with the Complaint and the Response, the Panel finds that the supplemental submissions of the Parties address issues that they could not have contemplated and addressed in the Complaint and in the Response, which makes them relevant and justifies their acceptance in the proceedings.

Therefore, the Panel decides to accept and take into account the Parties' supplemental submissions.

6.3. Substantive issues

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 3.0, section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the EMCD trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.2.1. The EMCD trademark is a combined trademark and includes a word element "emcd" in stylized white letters over a black rectangle. The "emcd" word element in the trademark dominates in it.

As discussed in section 1.10 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, Panel assessment of identity or confusing similarity involves comparing the (alpha-numeric) domain name and the textual components of trademarks with design elements. To the extent that design (or figurative/stylized) elements would be incapable of representation in domain names, these elements are largely disregarded for purposes of assessing identity or confusing similarity under the first element.

The dominating word element of the EMCD trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name without the addition of any other elements. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's EMCD trademark for the purposes of the Policy.

The Panel therefore finds that the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant claims that the Respondent is not commonly known under the disputed domain name and has not been authorized by it to register and use the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the use of the disputed domain name for a website discussing the European Union Directive 2014/30/EU is pretextual, and the actual purpose for which the Respondent has used the disputed domain name is related to cryptocurrency activities targeting the Complainant's EMCD trademark.

The Respondent maintains that he has registered and used the disputed domain name solely for the purpose of an educational and informational website dedicated to the European Union Directive 2014/30/EU, and denies having carried out any operations through the disputed domain name that are related to cryptocurrencies.

This boils down to two key issues – whether the Respondent has carried out a genuine legitimate noncommercial use of the disputed domain name related to the European Union Directive 2014/30/EU, and whether the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in relation to cryptocurrency operations targeting the Complainant's EMCD trademark.

As to the first issue, the Panel considers the following:

As discussed in section 2.5 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, fundamentally, a respondent's use of a domain name will not be considered "fair" if it falsely suggests affiliation with the trademark owner; the correlation between a domain name and the complainant's mark is often central to this inquiry. Generally speaking, UDRP panels have found that domain names identical to a complainant's trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation.

Here, the disputed domain name is identical to the dominating word element of the Complainant's EMCD trademark and to the abbreviation "emcd", which is being used to refer to the European Union Directive 2014/30/EU. The disputed domain name is also similar to the Complainant's domain name <emcd.io> and to its trade name EMCD Tech Ltd.

As discussed in section 2.10 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, Panels have recognized that merely registering a domain name comprised of a dictionary word or phrase does not by itself automatically confer rights or legitimate interests on the respondent; panels have held that mere arguments that a domain name corresponds to a dictionary term/phrase will not necessarily suffice. In order to find rights or legitimate interests in a domain name based on its dictionary meaning, the domain name should be genuinely used, or at least demonstrably intended for such use, in connection with the relied-upon dictionary meaning and not to trade off third-party trademark rights. For a respondent to have rights or legitimate interests in a domain

name comprising an acronym, the respondent's evidence supporting its explanation for its registration (and any use) of the domain name should indicate a credible and legitimate intent which does not capitalize on the reputation and goodwill inherent in the complainant's mark.

As admitted by the Respondent, he activated his website only after the receipt of notice of the dispute. This happened six months after the registration of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not provided any evidence of his expertise, affiliation, or prior engagement in the highly-specialized field of technical European Union regulation, although prompted to do so by the Complainant. He has not provided any details for his plans how to use his website and carry out his alleged educational activities in the future; there is no explanation how the Respondent's activities will be funded, if it is a noncommercial project. The Respondent has not explained why, if the purpose of his alleged project was the education of the public, he would choose to register and operate the disputed domain name and website focused on one particular European Union directive, rather than a more general domain name and website focused on electromagnetic compatibility as such. The content of this website is not an original work of the Respondent, but only a shortened and simplified summary (with removed definitions) of an already published content on a third-party website,[2] and does not appear to have required significant efforts, time, or special knowledge for its preparation and publication. The text contains no technical details and no references, apart from the link to the original source and to the official text of the regulation, and appears to be directed at the general public, rather than at engineers, manufacturers, and students (the alleged target audience) who are likely to need detailed information on the topic. The website is published in English and not in Russian, and there is no explanation from the Respondent why he chose to publish it in this language. The webpage is static and does not suggest to visitors to expect to find on it further materials in the future.

Considering all the above, the Panel is not convinced that the Respondent has indeed engaged in a real educational project related to the European Union Directive 2014/30/EU. As claimed by the Complainant, it appears as more likely than not that the creation and activation by the Respondent of the webpage at the disputed domain name after the notice of these proceedings was a hastily-prepared attempt to set up a defense against the Complaint.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent has not established that he is carrying out a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name that would give rise to rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

As discussed in the following section related to bad faith, it seems more likely than not that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in relation to cryptocurrency operations targeting the Complainant's EMCD trademark, which cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The second element of the Policy has therefore 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.

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.

[2] The original article is available at "https://certifycomply.com/about-ce-marking/the-electromagnetic-compatibility-directive/"

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activities (here, claimed impersonation of the Complainant) 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.

As discussed in section 4.2 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, the applicable standard of proof in UDRP cases is the "balance of probabilities" or "preponderance of the evidence"; some panels have also expressed this as an "on balance" standard. Under this standard, a party should demonstrate to a panel's satisfaction that it is more likely than not that a claimed fact is true. While conclusory statements unsupported by evidence will normally be insufficient to prove a party's case, panels have been prepared to draw certain inferences in light of the particular facts and circumstances of the case, e.g., where a particular conclusion is prima facie obvious, where an explanation by the respondent is called for but is not forthcoming, or where no other plausible conclusion is apparent.

As also discussed in section 3.4 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for purposes other than to host a website may constitute bad faith. Such purposes include sending email, phishing, identity theft, or malware distribution. Many such cases involve the respondent's use of the domain name to send deceptive emails, e.g., to obtain sensitive or confidential personal information from prospective job applicants, or to solicit payment of fraudulent invoices by the complainant's actual or prospective customers.

In the present case, the Complainant claims that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in connection with cryptocurrency mining pool stratum servers (working mirrors) – a highly-specific technical use uniquely associated with cryptocurrency mining operations, which is the core business of the Complainant. According to the Complainant, by using the EMCD trademark in the disputed domain name for these purposes, the Respondent is effectively impersonating the Complainant, which creates a severe risk of consumer confusion, damages the Complainant's reputation, and exposes users to potential fraud or security risks. The Complainant maintains that the Respondent's claim of a noncommercial educational website is directly contradicted by the evidence, and is only a pretext to conceal the Respondent's bad faith registration and use.

The evidence submitted by the Complainant with its supplementary submission includes screenshots from chat rooms discussing detailed technical aspects of cryptocurrency mining operations, including the stratum server addresses for the Complainant's EMCD mining pool used to mine cryptocurrency, and specifically mention server addresses that have been set up at the disputed domain name. A post, dated June 12, 2025, states that "[…] in relation to the latest events and the blockages by the RKN,[3] we have prepared working mirrors for the popular mining pools so that you may continue to mine cryptocurrencies without unnecessary complications" (translation from originally Russian: "[…] в связи с последними событиями и блокировками со стороны РКН мы подготовили рабочие зекрала для популярных майнинг-пулов, чтобы вы могли продолджить добывать криптовалюту без лишних сложностей […]." The same post lists a series of stratum server addresses set up at the disputed domain name. Another of these posts is from an Internet user who appears to have been unaware that the stratum server addresses set up at the disputed domain name are not official.

The Respondent maintains that no stratum server, mining mirror, or cryptocurrency-related service has ever been hosted or operated by him at the disputed domain name or any of its subdomains, and that he has never configured, deployed, or authorized any infrastructure related to cryptocurrency mining. According to the Respondent, the screenshots submitted by the Complainant are from unidentified private chat communications, and do not demonstrate the existence of a server, any hosting activity, a DNS configuration specific to mining, or any control by the Respondent.

[3] This abbreviation RKN likely stands for "Roskomnadzor" - the Federal Service for Supervision of Communications, Information Technology and Mass Media of the Russian Federation.

As discussed in the previous section on rights and legitimate interests, the Respondent's allegations that he has registered and used the disputed domain name solely for the purposes of an education project focused on the European Union Directive 2014/30/EU are superficial and unconvincing, and the webpage at the disputed domain name appears to have been made in an attempt to set up a defense against the Complaint. The adoption of such tactics by the Respondent discredits his statements and denials in these proceedings.

Considering the above, the Panel accepts as more likely than not that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name for cryptocurrency related operations. Since the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, this creates a risk that Internet users involved in cryptocurrency mining may be confused to wrongly believe that they are using mining infrastructure that is under the control of the Complainant, which may expose them to significant risks.

This supports a finding that by registering and using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to an online location at the disputed domain name, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's EMCD trademark as to the source of the Respondent's online location or of the services provided there, which supports a finding of bad faith under Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel therefore 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 <emcd.me> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Assen Alexiev/
Assen Alexiev
Sole Panelist
Date: December 31, 2025