

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

H. Lundbeck A/S v. Evrard Therriault  
Case No. D2024-1305

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is H. Lundbeck A/S, Denmark, represented by Zacco Denmark A/S, Denmark.

The Respondent is Evrard Therriault, France.

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

The disputed domain name <lexaproinfo24.com> is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 27, 2024. On March 27, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 28, 2024, 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 sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 2, 2024, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on April 8, 2024.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 9, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 29, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 30, 2024.

The Center appointed Adam Taylor as the sole panelist in this matter on May 7, 2024. 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 an international pharmaceutical company. Its products include an antidepressant called LEXAPRO.

The Complainant owns many registered trade marks for LEXAPRO including European Union trade mark No. 002041259, registered on December 16, 2003, in class 5.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 6, 2024.

As of March 27, 2024, the disputed domain name resolved to a website headed “Lexapro Online Buy”, which purported to provide information about the Complainant’s product.

#### **5. Parties’ Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for transfer of the disputed domain name. Notably, the Complainant expresses concern that the disputed domain name may be used for e-mail fraud.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

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

Under the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove on the balance of probabilities that:

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

##### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant’s trade mark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark 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 confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, “info24”) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognised 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. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

As to paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, and as further discussed in section 6C below, the Panel considers that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, confuse and profit from Internet users seeking the Complainant’s goods and/or services. Such use of the disputed domain name could not be said to be bona fide.

Nor is there any evidence that paragraphs 4(c)(ii) or (iii) of the Policy are relevant in the circumstances of this case.

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

## **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel considers that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trade mark in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Not only does the disputed domain name reflect the Complainant’s distinctive mark, but the Respondent has used the disputed domain name for a website that purports to provide information about the Complainant’s product in a manner that creates the impression that it is officially associated with the Complainant including by prominent use of the Complainant’s mark and by the lack of any prominent disclaimer.

In these circumstances, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent’s intent was on commercial gain, whether through sale of the Complainant’s products, as indicated by the heading “Lexapro Online Buy”, or through some sort of potential e-mail fraud, which the Respondent has not appeared in this proceeding to deny, or otherwise.

The Panel 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 <lexaproinfo24.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Adam Taylor/*

**Adam Taylor**

Sole Panelist

Date: May 20, 2024