

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Capsugel Belgium NV v. ilyas YILMAZ  
Case No. D2024-2365

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Capsugel Belgium NV, Belgium, represented by Greer, Burns & Crain, Ltd., United States of America (“United States”).

The Respondent is ilyas YILMAZ, Türkiye, self-represented.

### **2. The Domain Name (and Registrar)**

The disputed domain name <duocap.com> is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 11, 2024. On June 11, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 12, 2024, 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 and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 14, 2024 providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint.

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 July 1, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 27, 2024. The Response was filed with the Center July 26, 2024.

On August 27, 2024, the Complainant filed a supplemental filing. On September 11, 2024, the Respondent filed a supplemental filing.

The Center appointed Andrew D. S. Lothian, Flip Jan Claude Petillion, and Emre Kerim Yardimci as panelists in this matter on October 1, 2024. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. Each member of 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.

On October 5, 2024, the Complainant filed a second supplemental filing.

#### 4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a Belgian company (Naamloze vennootschap) which provides manufacturing services to the pharmaceutical, biotech, and specialty ingredients markets. The Complainant is part of a corporate group named Lonza Group Ltd. In 2022, Lonza Group Ltd reported revenues of CHF 2.4 billion in the United States alone, and CHF 6.2 billion worldwide. Since 2010, the Complainant has adopted and used the mark DUOCAP in the United States in the pharmaceutical, biotechnology, and nutrition space, and in custom manufacturing. The Complainant's corporate group promotes products under such mark on its website at "www.capsugel.com".

The Complainant is the owner of registered trademarks in over 11 countries for the mark DUOCAP in respect of a variety of goods and services, the earliest of which appears to have been registered on July 5, 2016. For example, the Complainant is the owner of United States Registered Trademark Number 4991824 for the word mark DUOCAP, registered on July 5, 2016, in respect of formulation services in Class 42. Said mark is accompanied by a claim of first use, and first use in commerce, dated November 3, 2010. The Complainant is also the owner of United States Registered Trademark Number 6240397 for the word mark DUOCAP, registered on January 5, 2021, in respect of empty capsules for pharmaceutical use in Class 20. Said mark is accompanied by a claim of first use, and first use in commerce, dated February 4, 2019.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 9, 2009. The Respondent is an individual based in Türkiye. The Respondent is also the sole owner of companies named SENSE GIDA VE SAĞLIK ÜRÜNLERİ SANAYİ TİCARET LİMİTED ŞİRKETİ and ELEVE İLAÇ SANAYİ VE TİCARET ANONİM ŞİRKETİ. The Panel treats the Respondent and its companies as one and the same for the purposes of the present administrative proceeding.

The Respondent is not the original registrant of the disputed domain name, which was the Complainant or its predecessor in interest (a United Kingdom company named MW Encap Ltd) from December 9, 2009 until a date between August 1, 2019 and November 30, 2021, according to the Complainant's review of entries on the Internet Archive. The limited number of available historic Whois records for the disputed domain name also provide support for the notion that the disputed domain name was held by the Complainant's said predecessor in interest until (at least) its expiration date of December 9, 2018.

Internet Archive entries show that between November 30, 2021 and January 31, 2024, the disputed domain name was offered for sale on an aftermarket website for the asking price of USD 16,000. A historic Whois query in respect of the disputed domain name dated March 28, 2024 shows the Registrar as the registrar of record, and contains a 'modified' date of February 5, 2024 and delegated nameservers for a Turkish Internet service provider, suggesting that this is the date on which the Respondent most likely acquired the disputed domain name.

According to a screenshot produced by the Complainant, as of May 31, 2024, the website associated with the disputed domain name stated, inter alia, "Duocap is the name given to capsules produced by placing one capsule inside another. Capsugel is the company that invented this technology. [...] Capsugel is a leading company in the capsule manufacturing sector and is known for its innovative solutions in this field." Said site, which is also partially under construction (containing "Lorem ipsum" dummy text in places) also states "Duocap manufacturer [...] It may be the best choice in this field [...] Sense Gida Istanbul TURKEY." The copy adds, "Who produces where? [...] On the other hand, Sense Gida is a company that has the technology of Capsugel. Sense Gida produces high-quality and effective products for dietary supplements

and the pharmaceutical industry.” Finally, under the heading “Manufacturing Companies”, the screenshot shows a listing relating to the Complainant’s parent company in the words, “Capsugel – www.lonza.com” along with a reference to the Respondent’s company immediately below, “Sense/TURKEY – www.sensegida.com”.

In 2023, the Respondent’s company, SENSE GIDA VE SAĞLIK ÜRÜNLERİ SANAYİ TİCARET LİMİTED ŞİRKETİ, made various applications for registered trademarks in Türkiye that are relevant to this administrative proceeding. Namely, it filed Turkish trademark applications nos. 2023/158735 for DUOCAP and 2023/158746 for DUOCAPSULE. It also filed Turkish trademark application no. 2023/169867 for DUOCAP.

On January 16, 2024, the Complainant filed two opposition proceedings in Türkiye against said applications nos. 2023/158735 and 2023/158746. On February 16, 2024, the Complainant filed an additional opposition proceeding against said application no. 2023/169867.

On June 14, 2024 (notified to the Complainant on June 21, 2024) the Turkish trademark office granted the Complainant’s opposition against the Respondent’s Turkish trademark application no. 2023/169867 for DUOCAP on the grounds that the trademark application had been filed in bad faith. On June 26, 2024, the Turkish trademark office granted the Complainant’s opposition against the Respondent’s Turkish trademark application no. 2023/158735 for DUOCAP also on the grounds that the application had been filed in bad faith, notably that the high level of similarity between the term and the registrations abroad led to the conclusion that the term could not have been chosen by chance. On July 16, 2024, a decision in application 2023/158746 in respect of DUOCAPSULE was given in the Respondent’s company’s favor, on the basis of perceived lack of similarity between the marks, subject to an appeal within two months of the decision. Related proceedings are ongoing.

According to a screenshot produced by the Complainant, on July 1, 2024, the disputed domain name was offered for sale on an aftermarket website at the asking price of USD 1,000,000. According to another screenshot produced by the Complainant, as of August 23, 2024, the website associated with the disputed domain name had been updated and was being used on behalf of the Respondent’s company to sell “capsule within a capsule” technology under the mark DUOCAP and DUOCAP IN TURKEY, noting that said technology “was previously imported only to our country” and “is now produced 100% domestically and nationally.” Said site adds “Duocap is produced in some countries in Turkey by SENSE FOOD and HEALTH PRODUCTS using CAPSUGEL brand machines. (Capsugel is the scissors of the machines used, it is used to indicate the name of the machine. We have no affiliation or affiliation with the brand).”

The Respondent produces evidence, some dated and some undated, suggesting that it has been engaging in promotional activities under the brand “duocap” from late 2023 (insofar as the evidence is dated), including attendance at and sponsorship of various trade shows and events, primarily in Türkiye.

## **5. Parties’ Contentions**

### **A. Complainant**

In summary, the Complainant contends as follows:

The disputed domain name comprises the Complainant’s DUOCAP mark in its entirety along with the suffix “.com”. Where a domain name contains the entire mark and differs only by the suffix, such difference is generally insufficient to overcome confusing similarity between that domain name and mark.

The term “duocap” is not an applied for or registered trademark of the Respondent. The Whois history shows that the disputed domain name was updated to the Respondent on March 25, 2024. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its DUOCAP trademark by license or otherwise, or to apply for any confusingly similar domain name. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to

falsely hold itself out as associated with the Complainant and its products, causing confusion. This is not a bona fide offering of goods and services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Said website references the Complainant while falsely claiming to be a manufacturer of products under the DUOCAP mark, and links to the Respondent's other website at "www.sensegida.com", where the Respondent continues to advertise unlawfully to consumers that it offers goods under the DUOCAP mark. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name according to the Whois record.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. The Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its rights in the DUOCAP mark given the Respondent's incorporation of said mark in the disputed domain name and its reference to the Complainant's business, and goods and services. Bad faith may be reasonably inferred. Panels have consistently held that when an unaffiliated entity registers a domain name, which is confusingly similar or identical to a famous or widely known trademark, a presumption of bad faith is inferred.

As further evidence of bad faith, the website associated with the disputed domain name contains content related to the sale of medical products, supplies, and equipment, being industries in which the Complainant operates.

## **B. Respondent**

In summary, the Respondent contends as follows:

The brand "Duocap" has serious use in Türkiye by a completely different company from the Complainant and has been heavily invested in for a long time, including by way of attendance at international fairs. It is unfounded for the Complainant to object to the Respondent's brand when the Complainant's mark is not registered in Türkiye.

The Respondent applied to the patent and trademark authority in Türkiye under application numbered 2023/158746 for the mark DUOCAPSULE, and after opposition by the Complainant, a decision was given in the Respondent's favor because the Complainant and Respondent's marks are independent of one another. The priority right to the mark in Türkiye belongs to the Respondent as it first thought of and used said mark on goods or services in Türkiye. The Respondent's trademark is DUOCAP and the Complainant's mark is used as DUO, and there is no possibility of confusion. There is no visual, phonetic, shape, color, or stylized font character similarity. A holistic approach should be taken to the image that the mark leaves in the consumer's memory, and moderate or conscious consumers would not confuse the Respondent's brand with that of the Complainant.

The Respondent's company maintains a supplement manufacturing factory with state of the art equipment using automation and robotics. Said company is reputable, with many patented and certified products by approved organizations. Significant investments have been made in the brand and by participation in international fairs. The Parties' brands serve completely different purposes, and the Respondent's brand has achieved recognition due to serious ongoing investments in Türkiye.

## **C. Complainant's First Supplemental Filing**

In summary, the Complainant contends as follows:

The facts that the Complainant seeks to put forward were not available before the period in which the Complainant was allowed to amend its Complaint. The Complainant seeks to have admitted all decisions in the Turkish trademark opposition proceedings in application nos. 2023/158735, 2023/158746, and 2023/169867, which post-date, or the notification of which to the Complainant post-dates, the deadline to amend the Complaint. Said decisions are administrative in nature and do not directly involve the disputed domain name. The Respondent has omitted the two decisions that are unfavorable to it from the Response. The application for DUOCAP trademarks is identical to the disputed domain name (absent the suffix). The

oppositions were granted on the basis of filing an application in bad faith and that the term could not have been chosen by chance when considering the high levels of similarity with the Complainant's foreign marks. The decision in application no. 2023/158746 in the Respondent's favor was based on a perceived lack of similarity between the marks, and did not make a finding on the bad faith issue. In two different proceedings, the Respondent's attempts to commandeer DUOCAP were found to be in bad faith. The Respondent deliberately omitted said decisions in the Response.

The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name after the Complaint was filed should also be admitted. The Respondent's offer to sell the disputed domain name for a sum of USD 1,000,000 far exceeds its out of pocket costs to register and maintain it. This is evidence of registration and use in bad faith.

The update to the website associated with the disputed domain name demonstrated the Respondent's bad faith as it attempts to trade on the goodwill associated with a mark in which the Complainant has rights. The brand new disclaimer acts as an admission that the Complainant is the rightful rights holder and that the Respondent has no legitimate right to use the DUOCAP mark.

#### **D. Respondent's Supplemental Filing**

In summary, the Respondent contends as follows:

The Respondent has filed an objection to the Turkish trademark office's decision with regard to the DUOCAP applications. The process regarding the DUOCAPSULE application continues. The Respondent has provided evidence of use of said marks. No final decisions have been given, and the Respondent expects a favorable determination in due course. As the decisions are not final, the Respondent requests that the information relating to the trademark application processes not be admitted.

#### **E. Complainant's Second Supplemental Filing**

For the reasons noted below, the Complainant's second supplemental filing was not admitted.

### **6. Discussion and Findings**

#### **A. Preliminary Matters: Parties' Supplemental Filings and other legal proceedings**

Paragraph 12 of the Rules expressly provides that it is for the panel to request, in its sole discretion, any further statements or documents from the parties it may deem necessary to decide the case. Unsolicited supplemental filings are generally discouraged, unless specifically requested by the panel. Panels have repeatedly affirmed that the party submitting or requesting to submit an unsolicited supplemental filing should clearly show its relevance to the case and why it was unable to provide the information contained therein in its complaint or response (e.g., owing to some "exceptional" circumstance). WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 4.6.

Here, in its first supplemental filing, the Complainant sought to answer the terms of the Response regarding the Respondent's trademark applications, notably the fact that the Complainant wished to point out that the Respondent was being selective in reporting the terms of one of its three applications. The Complainant explained that the outcome of its oppositions to said applications was not included in the Complaint because the opposition proceedings are administrative in nature and not strictly relevant to matters concerning the disputed domain name, and more importantly, the Complainant was not notified of the outcome of its various oppositions until after the period for amending the Complaint had expired. The Panel considered that the terms of the Response on this topic (i.e., that the Respondent had been successful in a trademark application) was not something that the Complainant could reasonably have anticipated in the Complaint based upon the timeline and, consequently, it allowed the Complainant's first supplemental filing to be admitted. The Panel also allowed the Respondent's supplemental filing to be admitted on the basis that the Respondent should be permitted to answer that of the Complainant.

The Panel has decided not to admit the Complainant's second supplemental filing. While this does contain new information, the Panel considers that it comes too late in the day to merit consideration, noting that paragraph 10 of the Rules vests the panel with the authority to conduct the proceedings with due expedition.

The Panel notes for completeness that the trademark opposition proceedings discussed in the Response and admitted supplemental filings which are still pending between the Parties are not, strictly speaking, legal proceedings in respect of a domain name dispute that is the subject of the Complaint in terms of paragraph 18(a) of the Rules. Accordingly, the Panel does not require to decide whether to suspend or terminate the administrative proceeding in consequence and will proceed to a decision on the merits.

## **B. 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 a trademark or service 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 identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Insofar as the Respondent's submissions concerning the differences between the Parties' trademarks and lack of consumer confusion are directed to the first element analysis, the Panel rejects these on the basis that issues such as the strength of the Complainant's mark or the Respondent's intent to provide its own legitimate offering of goods or services without trading off the Complainant's reputation are decided under the second and third elements of the Policy. Panels view the first element as a threshold test concerning a trademark owner's standing to file a UDRP complaint, i.e., to ascertain whether there is a sufficient nexus to assess the principles captured in the second and third elements. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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

## **C. 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 based on its submissions that it has not authorized the Respondent to use its DUOCAP trademark by license or otherwise, that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to hold itself out falsely as associated with the Complainant and its products, and that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name according to the Whois record. The Panel therefore turns to consider the Respondent's case in rebuttal.

In essence, the Respondent submits that it is making legitimate, independent use in Türkiye of the DUOCAP mark (as represented in its trademark applications, trade show materials, and in the disputed domain name), that it has made heavy investment in the same, that the Complainant's mark is not registered in Türkiye, that the Respondent has applied for relevant registered trademarks in Türkiye, and that there is no possibility of consumer confusion arising from the Parties' respective offerings under the DUOCAP mark.

The principal question for the Panel is whether the Respondent's offering of goods or services by way of the disputed domain name is bona fide. The Panel notes that on the earliest available iteration of the website associated with the disputed domain name after acquisition by the Respondent, the Respondent has directly referenced the Complainant and its offerings, notably by referring to "Capsugel" and providing hyperlinks to the Complainant's own website. Using or permitting the use of such website content could hardly be described as the actions of a respondent which has come up with the term "duocap" independently of the Complainant and its rights. The Respondent continued to make similar references on the later iteration of the website associated with the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Respondent's activities are targeting the Complainant's mark with an intention to benefit commercially from confusion arising.

The Panel notes in particular that the Respondent did not acquire the disputed domain name until February 5, 2024 at the earliest, and that the promotional activities in which it has engaged date from late 2023 to date. Yet the Complainant's DUOCAP trademark dates back to 2016, and has been in use since 2010, and the evidence strongly indicates that the Respondent was aware of it when it acquired the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the Panel is satisfied that both the Respondent's promotional activities and its acquisition of the disputed domain name were carried out in the knowledge of the Complainant's rights in the DUOCAP mark. Notably, the Respondent produces what it describes as "fair photos" covering its activities at various promotional events, which include photographs of a machine branded "CAPSUGEL®" that clearly references the Complainant and one of its brands. The Respondent's suggestion that there is no confusion because the Parties are making different uses of the "duocap" brand does not stand up to scrutiny. The Respondent's website content expressly makes reference to the Complainant and would inevitably lead to confusion. In all of these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name could not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy.

The Panel is aware that the Respondent's prosecution of its various trademark applications for marks corresponding to the disputed domain name is or may be continuing. However, the Panel's position would not necessarily have been any different had the Respondent's marks proceeded to grant, noting that the existence of a respondent trademark does not automatically confer rights or legitimate interests on the respondent. For example, panels have generally declined to find respondent rights or legitimate interests in a domain name on the basis of a corresponding trademark registration where the overall circumstances demonstrate that such trademark was obtained primarily to circumvent the application of the UDRP or otherwise prevent the complainant's exercise of its rights (even if only in a particular jurisdiction). [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.12.2. Here, the Respondent's acquisition of the disputed domain name and application to register corresponding trademarks is intimately bound up with the Complainant's rights in the DUOCAP trademark, as demonstrated by the iterations of the website associated with the disputed domain name which show the Respondent's knowledge of and make specific references to the Complainant.

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

#### **D. 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes as discussed in the preceding section that the Respondent acquired the disputed domain name with prior knowledge of the Complainant's DUOCAP mark and with intent to target the same for its own commercial gain. The Respondent's attempt to assert that its use of the term "duocap" in the disputed domain name and on the associated website is genuinely independent of the Complainant's rights does not stand up to scrutiny based in particular on its direct references to the Complainant on said website.

Furthermore, although the Respondent answered aspects of the Complainant's first supplemental filing, the Respondent's own supplemental filing was notably silent as to the evidence produced by the Complainant showing that, as of July 1, 2024 the disputed domain name has been offered for sale in the sum of USD 1,000,000 on an aftermarket website. In the circumstances of this case, if such listing was not made at the Respondent's behest, the Panel would have expected the Respondent to issue a firm and unequivocal statement to that effect rather than to remain silent. Consequently, the fact that such listing has been made is, in and of itself, strongly indicative of Respondent bad faith in the circumstances of the present case. It is also entirely inconsistent with the Respondent's assertions that it is engaging in a legitimate business that makes an independent and unrelated use of the term "duocap" from that of the Complainant and its rights.

Turning briefly to the present iteration of the website associated with the disputed domain name, the Panel notes the presence of an apparent disclaimer in the words, "Duocap is produced in some countries in Turkey by SENSE FOOD and HEALTH PRODUCTS using CAPSUGEL brand machines. (Capsugel is the scissors of the machines used, it is used to indicate the name of the machine. We have no affiliation or affiliation with the brand)." The Panel notes that this wording appears some way down the home page and is not particularly prominent. Furthermore, it is found well below multiple misleading uses of the Complainant's DUOCAP mark in phrases such as "DUOCAP IN TURKEY / MADE IN TURKEY", and references to DUOCAP as the subject of previous imports to the country but now "produced 100% domestically and nationally" by which the Respondent means that products bearing the (Complainant's) mark, formerly imported, are now being manufactured domestically by the Respondent's company, suggesting endorsement or sponsorship by the Complainant where none exists.

Where the overall circumstances of a case point to the respondent's bad faith, the mere existence of a disclaimer cannot cure such bad faith. In such cases, panels may consider the respondent's use of a disclaimer as an admission by the respondent that users may be confused. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.7. Here, the Panel considers that the disputed domain name, supplemented by both the previous and current versions of the associated website, are highly likely to cause confusion with the Complainant's mark, and furthermore that the Respondent was aware of this when it registered and used the disputed domain name. The reference to "Capsugel" in the context of the machines used to produce the product amply demonstrates the Respondent's awareness of the Complainant and its rights. The disclaimer, which may clarify to some extent the reference to "CAPSUGEL brand machines", does nothing to clear up or avoid the confusion arising from the Respondent's widespread use of the Complainant's DUOCAP mark on the website associated with the disputed domain name.

In all of these circumstances, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.



## 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 <duocap.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Andrew D. S. Lothian/*

**Andrew D. S. Lothian**

Presiding Panelist

*/Flip Jan Claude Petillion/*

**Flip Jan Claude Petillion**

Panelist

*/Emre Kerim Yardimci/*

**Emre Kerim Yardimci**

Panelist

Date: October 15, 2024