

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sanofi v. Jen Ressa
Case No. D2023-1662

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Jen Ressa, United States of America (“United States”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <careers-sanofi.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 17, 2023. On April 17, 2023, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On April 6, 2023, 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 for the Domain Name.

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 May 1, 2023. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 21, 2023. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 24, 2023.

The Center appointed Nicholas Smith as the sole panelist in this matter on May 31, 2023. 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 is a French multinational pharmaceutical company headquartered in Paris. The Complainant engages in research and development, manufacturing and marketing of pharmaceutical products for sale, principally in the prescription market, but also develops over-the-counter medication. The Complainant and its predecessors in title have used Sanofi as a name and brand for over 30 years. The Complainant has operations in more than 100 countries employing 100,000 people and had sales of EUR 37.7 billion in 2021.

The Complainant and its predecessors in title have held trademark registrations for SANOFI (the “SANOFI Mark”) since at least 1988. Its trademark registrations for the SANOFI Mark cover a range of pharmaceutical products, and include registrations in the United States, the location of the Respondent (trademark registration number 4,178,199, registered July 24, 2012).

The Domain Name was registered on February 13, 2023. The Domain Name resolves to a website offering pay-per-click advertisements including advertisements for pharmaceutical products.

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 Domain Name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that;

- a) It is the owner of the SANOFI Mark, having registered the SANOFI Mark in the United States. The Domain Name is confusingly similar to the SANOFI Mark as it reproduces the SANOFI Mark in its entirety and adds the descriptive term “careers” and a hyphen.
- b) There are no rights or legitimate interests held by the Respondent in respect of the Domain Name. The Complainant has not granted any license or authorization for the Respondent to use the SANOFI Mark. The Respondent is not commonly known by the SANOFI Mark, nor does it use the Domain Name for a *bona fide* purpose or legitimate noncommercial purpose. Instead, the Domain Name resolves to a pay-per-click site that advertises pharmaceutical products in competition with the Complainant. Such use of the Domain Name cannot and does not constitute *bona fide* commercial use, sufficient to legitimize any rights or interests the Respondent might have in the Domain Name and therefore the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.
- c) The Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. There is no plausible circumstance under which the Respondent could legitimately use the Domain Name, which combines the SANOFI Mark and the term “careers-”, other than in bad faith. The Respondent is passively holding the Domain Name by having the Domain Name resolve to a pay-per-click website. In such circumstances, the Respondent’s conduct amounts to use of the Domain Name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 Panel finds the entirety of the mark is reproduced within the Domain Name. Accordingly, the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of other terms here, "careers", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

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.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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 record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a *prima facie* case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the 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 Domain Name.

The Panel considers that the record of this case reflects that:

- before any notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the Respondent did not use, nor has it made 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. Paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.2.
- the Respondent (as an individual, business, or other organization) has not been commonly known by the Domain Name. Paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.3.
- the Respondent is not 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. Paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.4.

- the record contains no other factors demonstrating rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the Domain Name.

The use of the Domain Name for a parking page with pay-per-click links unrelated to a dictionary meaning of the Domain Name is not a *bona fide* offering of goods or services nor legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

The Panel notes the statements in the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) on the question of whether “parked” pages comprising pay-per-click links support the respondent’s rights or legitimate interests. Section 2.9 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) notes that:

“Applying UDRP paragraph 4(c), panels have found that the use of a domain name to host a parked page comprising PPC [pay-per-click] links does not represent a bona fide offering where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant’s mark or otherwise mislead Internet users. Panels have recognized that the use of a domain name to host a page comprising PPC links would be permissible – and therefore consistent with respondent rights or legitimate interests under the UDRP – where the domain name consists of an actual dictionary word(s) or phrase and is used to host PPC links genuinely related to the dictionary meaning of the word(s) or phrase comprising the domain name, and not to trade off the complainant’s (or its competitor’s) trademark.”

In the present case, the Respondent’s use of the confusingly similar Domain Name to host a parking page with pay-per-click links referring to the pharmaceutical products offered by the Complainant does not provide the Respondent with rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name as the pharmaceutical products do not correspond to any non-trademark meaning of the words comprising the Domain Name.

Based on the available record, 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.

The Panel considers that the record of this case reflects that:

The Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s website or location or of a product or service on the Respondent’s website or location. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the Domain Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Domain Name, which wholly incorporates the coined and well-known SANOFI Mark, resolves to a page offering pay-per-click links for which the Respondent most likely would receive some commercial gain. In these circumstances where the Respondent has offered no plausible explanation for the registration of the Domain Name, the Panel finds that the Respondent was most likely aware of the Complainant at the time of registration and is using the Domain Name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the SANOFI Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s website.

Based on the available record, 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 Domain Name, <careers-sanofi.com> be cancelled.

/Nicholas Smith/

Nicholas Smith

Sole Panelist

Date: June 9, 2023