

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sanofi v. Quinlan Ronald

Case No. D2022-3997

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Sanofi, France, represented by Selarl Marchais & Associés, France.

The Respondent is Quinlan Ronald, United States of America (“United States”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <buyambienonlinepharmacy.net> is registered with Dreamscape Networks International Pte Ltd (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 25, 2022. On October 26, 2022, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 7, 2022, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

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 November 8, 2022. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 28, 2022. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 29, 2022. On December 1, 2022, the Center received an informal email communication from the Respondent.

The Center appointed Edoardo Fano as the sole panelist in this matter on December 6, 2022. 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.

The Panel has not received any requests from the Complainant or the Respondent regarding further submissions, waivers, or extensions of deadlines, and the Panel has not found it necessary to request any further information from the Parties.

Having reviewed the communication records in the case file provided by the Center, the Panel finds that the Center has discharged its responsibility under the Rules, paragraph 2(a), "to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to Respondent". Therefore, the Panel shall issue its Decision based upon the Complaint, the Policy, the Rules, and the Supplemental Rules and without the benefit of a formal response from the Respondent.

The language of the proceeding is English, being the language of the Registration Agreement, as per paragraph 11(a) of the Rules.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is Sanofi, a French company operating in the pharmaceutical field, owning several trademark registrations for AMBIEN, among which:

- French Trademark No. 93456039 for AMBIEN, registered on February 19, 1993;
- International Trademark No. 605762 for AMBIEN, registered on August 10, 1993;
- United States Trademark No. 1808770 for AMBIEN, registered on December 7, 1993;
- European Union Trademark No. 003991999 for AMBIEN, registered on November 28, 2005.

The Complainant also owns several domain names including the trademark AMBIEN, among which <ambien.com>, <ambien.net>, <ambien.org>, <ambien.info>.

The Complainant provided evidence in support of the above.

According to the WhoIs records, the disputed domain name was registered on March 23, 2016, and it resolves to a website where the Complainant's trademark is reproduced, and unauthorized and purportedly counterfeit Complainant's products are offered for sale.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark AMBIEN, as the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's trademark with the addition of the generic terms "buy", "online" and "pharmacy".

Moreover, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since it has not been authorized by the Complainant to register the disputed domain name or to use its trademark within the disputed domain name, it is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and it is not making either a *bona fide* offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name in connection with a website where the Complainant's trademark is reproduced, and unauthorized and purportedly counterfeit Complainant's products are offered for sale.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, since the Complainant's trademark AMBIEN is distinctive and internationally known in the pharmaceutical field. Therefore, the Respondent targeted the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name and the Complainant contends that the use of the disputed domain name with the purpose of selling unauthorized and potentially counterfeit goods by using the Complainant's trademark, creating a

likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark and trading upon the Complainant's reputation, qualifies as bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

The Respondent has made no formal reply to the Complainant's contentions.

A respondent is not obliged to participate in a proceeding under the Policy, but if it fails to do so, reasonable facts asserted by a complainant may be taken as true, and appropriate inferences, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, may be drawn (see, e.g., *Reuters Limited v. Global Net 2000, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0441](#); *Microsoft Corporation v. Freak Films Oy*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0109](#); *SSL International PLC v. Mark Freeman*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-1080](#); *Altavista Company v. Grandtotal Finances Limited et. al.*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0848](#); *Confédération Nationale du Crédit Mutuel, Caisse Fédérale du Crédit Mutuel Nord Europe v. Marketing Total S.A.*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-0288](#)).

In this case, the Respondent submitted an informal email communication on December 1, 2022, stating the following:

"Hi I will look on. I have gave my website to digital marketing company, they may spam my website. I will look on and get back to you."

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which the Complainant must satisfy in order to succeed:

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

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel finds that the Complainant is the owner of the trademark AMBIEN both by registration and acquired reputation and that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark AMBIEN.

Regarding the addition of the terms "buy", "online" and "pharmacy", the Panel notes that it is now well established that the addition of other terms or letters to a domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the trademark (see, e.g., *Aventis Pharma SA., Aventis Pharma Deutschland GmbH v. Jonathan Valicenti*, WIPO Case No. [D2005-0037](#); *Red Bull GmbH v. Chai Larbthanasub*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0709](#); *America Online, Inc. v. Dolphin@Heart*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0713](#)). The addition of the terms "buy", "online" and "pharmacy" does not therefore prevent the disputed domain name from being confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.8.

It is also well accepted that a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), in this case ".net", is typically ignored when assessing the confusing similarity between a trademark and a domain name. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has therefore met its burden of proving that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, pursuant to the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i).

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy requires the Complainant to prove that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent may establish rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name by demonstrating in accordance with paragraph 4(c) of the Policy any of the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation:

“(i) before any notice to you of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a *bona fide* offering of goods or services; or

(ii) you (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the domain name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) you are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.”

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant has the burden of proving the three elements of the Policy. However, satisfying the burden of proving a lack of the Respondent’s rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name according to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy is potentially quite difficult, since proving a negative circumstance is often more complicated than establishing a positive one. As such, it is well accepted that it is sufficient for the Complainant to make a *prima facie* case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name in order to shift the burden of production to the Respondent. If the Respondent fails to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name in accordance with paragraph 4(c) of the Policy or on any other basis, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

The Complainant in its Complaint, and as set out above, has established a *prima facie* case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. It asserts that the Respondent, who is not currently associated with the Complainant in any way, is not using the disputed domain name for a legitimate noncommercial or fair use or in connection with a *bona fide* offering of goods or services, but instead on the website at the disputed domain name the Complainant’s trademark is reproduced and unauthorized and purportedly counterfeit Complainant’s pharmaceutical products are offered for sale.

The *prima facie* case presented by the Complainant is enough to shift the burden of production to the Respondent to demonstrate that it has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. However, the Respondent has not presented any evidence of any rights or legitimate interests it may have in the disputed domain name.

According to the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13:

“2.13.1 Panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (*e.g.*, the sale of counterfeit goods or illegal pharmaceuticals, phishing, distributing malware, unauthorized account access/hacking, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent [...].”

Should the Complainant’s products sold on the website to which the disputed domain name is directing Internet users be genuine products, legitimately acquired by the Respondent, the question that would arise is whether the Respondent would therefore have a legitimate interest in using the disputed domain name that is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark in circumstances that are likely to give rise to confusion.

According to the current state of UDRP decisions in relation to the issue of resellers as summarized in the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.8.1:

“[...] resellers, distributors, or service providers using a domain name containing the complainant’s trademark to undertake sales or repairs related to the complainant’s goods or services may be making a *bona fide* offering of goods and services and thus have a legitimate interest in such domain name. Outlined in the ‘Oki Data test’, the following cumulative requirements will be applied in the specific conditions of a UDRP case:

- (i) the respondent must actually be offering the goods or services at issue;
- (ii) the respondent must use the site to sell only the trademarked goods or services;
- (iii) the site must accurately and prominently disclose the registrant’s relationship with the trademark holder; and
- (iv) the respondent must not try to ‘corner the market’ in domain names that reflect the trademark.”

This summary is based on the UDRP decision in *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#).

Even if the products sold by the Respondent were the Complainant’s genuine products, from inspection of the Respondent’s website, the Panel finds that the use of the Complainant’s trademark and the lack of any disclaimer would not make, under the Oki Data principles (see above), a *bona fide* offering of goods and services and thus a legitimate interest of the Respondent in the disputed domain name.

The Panel therefore concludes that the disputed domain name is not being used in connection with a *bona fide* offering of goods or services.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain names carries a risk of implied affiliation as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

The Panel therefore finds that paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy has been satisfied.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides that “[...] for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) , the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith:

- (i) circumstances indicating that [the Respondent has] registered or has 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 the complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of its documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) that [the Respondent has] 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 [the Respondent has] engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) that [the Respondent has] registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) that by using the domain name, [the Respondent has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the Respondent’s] web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the Respondent’s] web site or location or of a product or service on [the Respondent’s] web site or location.”

Regarding the registration in bad faith of the disputed domain name, the reputation of the Complainant's trademark AMBIEN in the pharmaceutical field is clearly established, and the Panel finds that the Respondent likely knew of the Complainant and deliberately registered the disputed domain name, especially because the disputed domain name resolves to a website in which the Complainant's trademark is reproduced and the same pharmaceutical products as the Complainant are offered for sale.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name is also being used in bad faith since the Respondent is trying to attract Internet users to its website by creating likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark in order to sell the same products as the Complainant's, an activity clearly detrimental to the Complainant's business.

The above suggests to the Panel that the Respondent intentionally registered and is using the disputed domain name in order both to disrupt the Complainant's business, in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iii) of the Policy, and to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Furthermore, the Panel considers that the nature of the inherently misleading disputed domain name, which includes the Complainant's trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the terms "buy", "online" and "pharmacy", further supports a finding of bad faith. See, [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has presented evidence to satisfy its burden of proof with respect to the issue of whether the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Panel therefore finds that paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy has been satisfied.

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 <buyambienonlinepharmacy.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Edoardo Fano/

Edoardo Fano

Sole Panelist

Date: December 12, 2022