

## Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-104073

Case number	CAC-UDRP-104073
Time of filing	2021-10-11 10:04:28
Domain names	PatientNovartisOncology.com

### Case administrator

Organization	Denisa Bilík (CAC) (Case admin)
--------------	---------------------------------

### Complainant

Organization	Novartis AG
--------------	-------------

### Complainant representative

Organization	BRANDIT GmbH
--------------	--------------

### Respondent

Name	Qian Meng Dan
------	---------------

#### OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings which are pending or decided and which relate to the disputed domain name.

#### IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant is the owner of the trademark NOVARTIS, China Trademark Registration No. 42520145 registered on September 7, 2020.

The Complainant also holds the domain name registrations which contain the NOVARTIS trademark, such as <novartis.com> and <novartis.com.cn> which were registered on April 2, 1996 and August 20, 1999 respectively.

#### FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, Novartis AG, was established in 1996 through a merger of two other companies, Ciba-Geigy and Sandoz. The Complainant is the holding company of the Novartis Group which is one of the biggest global pharmaceutical and healthcare groups. The Complainant's products are manufactured and sold in many regions worldwide including China. The Complainant has a strong presence in China where the Respondent is located. The Complainant states that it has been present in China for the last three decades, during which it launched about 62 medicines. The Complainant's official global and local websites in China connect customers to its official sales and service locations.

The disputed domain name <PatientNovartisOncology.com> was registered on September 1, 2021, which resolved to a

parking page containing pay-per-click (“PPC”) links.

---

#### PARTIES CONTENTIONS

NO ADMINISTRATIVELY COMPLIANT RESPONSE HAS BEEN FILED.

PARTIES' CONTENTIONS:

COMPLAINANT:

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the NOVARTIS mark on the basis that the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant’s trademark and the addition of the descriptive terms “patient” and “oncology” and generic top-level domain name suffix (“gTLD”) “.com” are insufficient to avoid the finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its NOVARTIS mark.

The Complainant also argues that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. In addition, the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant nor did the Complainant license or authorize the Respondent to use the NOVARTIS mark.

The Complainant further asserts that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith as the Respondent should have known of the Complainant’s NOVARTIS mark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant also asserts that the Respondent is attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent’s website, 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 of a product or service on the Respondent’s website.

---

#### RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

---

#### NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Respondent to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

---

#### BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

---

#### PROCEDURAL FACTORS

The Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under UDRP were met and there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

Preliminary Issue: Language of Proceedings

Paragraph 11 of the Rules provides that:

“(a) Unless otherwise agreed by the Parties, or specified otherwise in the Registration Agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the Registration Agreement, subject to the authority of the Panel to determine otherwise, having regard to the circumstances of the administrative proceeding.”

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name <PatientNovartisOncology.com> is Chinese. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for the following reasons:

(i) a reverse WHOIS search of the Respondent’s email showed that it has registered numerous domain names composed of English terms;

- (ii) the disputed domain name is in English;
- (iii) the website to which the disputed domain name resolves to is in English; and
- (iv) the proceeding will be put through unnecessary trouble and delay if Chinese were made the language of the proceeding.

The Respondent did not comment on the language of the proceeding.

The Panel cites the following with approval: "Thus, the general rule is that the parties may agree on the language of the administrative proceeding. In the absence of this agreement, the language of the Registration Agreement shall dictate the language of the proceeding. However, the Panel has the discretion to decide otherwise having regard to the circumstances of the case. The Panel's discretion must be exercised judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties taking into consideration matters such as command of the language, time and costs. It is important that the language finally decided by the Panel for the proceeding is not prejudicial to either one of the parties in his or her abilities to articulate the arguments for the case." (See *Groupe Auchan v. xmxzl*, WIPO Case No. DCC2006 0004).

Having considered the above factors, the Panel determines that English be the language of the proceeding. The Panel agrees that the Respondent appear to be familiar with the English language, taking into account its selection of the English-language trademark and the domain name in dispute. In the absence of an objection by the Respondent, the Panel does not find it procedurally efficient to have the Complainant translate the Complaint and evidence into Chinese.

---

#### PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

##### A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy requires a complainant to show that a domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights.

A registered trademark provides a clear indication that the rights in the mark shown on the trademark certificate belong to its respective owner. The Complainant has provided evidence that it owns the NOVARTIS trademark.

The differences between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's NOVARTIS trademark are the addition of the descriptive terms "patient" and "oncology" and a gTLD ".com".

It is established that the addition of a descriptive term would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.0"), section 1.8).

It is also established that gTLD is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test (WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.11). The addition of a gTLD to a disputed domain name does not avoid confusing similarity as the use of a TLD is technically required to operate a domain name (see *Accor v. Noldc Inc.* WIPO Case No. D2005-0016; *F. Hoffmann-La Roche AG v. Macalve e-dominios S.A.*, WIPO Case No. D2006-0451; *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. D2000-0003; *L'Oréal v Tina Smith*, WIPO Case No. 2013-0820; *Titoni AG v Runxin Wang*, WIPO Case No. D2008-0820; and *Alstom v. Itete Peru S.A.* WIPO Case No. D2009-0877).

The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's NOVARTIS mark and the addition of the descriptive terms "patient" and "oncology" and a gTLD ".com" which in the Panel's view does not avoid confusing similarity with the Complainant's trademark (see *Schneider Electric S.A. v. Domain Whois Protect Service / Cyber Domain Services Pvt. Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. D2015-2333; WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.9). in this case, the descriptive terms are related to the Complainant's business which further does not serve to obviate confusing similarity with the NOVARTIS mark.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the NOVARTIS mark and the element under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is satisfied.

## B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy requires the complainant to show that the respondent has no rights or interests in respect of the domain name. Once the complainant establishes a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the domain name, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to show that it has rights or legitimate interests in respect to the domain name (see WIPO Overview 3.0, paragraph 2.1).

In the present case, the Complainant has demonstrated prima facie that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and the Respondent has failed to assert any such rights or legitimate interests.

The Complainant submitted evidence that it did not authorize or license the Respondent to use the NOVARTIS mark (See OSRAM GmbH. v. Mohammed Rafi/Domain Admin, Privacy Protection Service INC d/b/a PrivacyProtect.org, WIPO Case No. D2015-1149; Sanofi-Aventis v. Abigail Wallace, WIPO Case No. D2009-0735).

In addition, the evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Respondent did not submit a response in the present case and did not provide any explanation or evidence to show rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name which is sufficient to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case. In the particular circumstances of the present case, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to host a parked page comprising PPC links which compete with the Complainant does not represent a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Panel is therefore of the view that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and accordingly, paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy is satisfied.

## C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The complainant must show that the respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith (Policy, paragraph 4(a)(iii)). Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides circumstances that may evidence bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

The Complainant has submitted evidence that the disputed domain name resolved to a parked page comprising PPC links which compete with the Complainant.

In this case, the evidence shows that the Complainant's mark is distinctive and has attained significant reputation. The strong reputation and distinctive character of the Complainant's mark is evidence that the Respondent is unlikely to have registered the disputed domain name without sight and knowledge of the Complainant's marks and it is implausible that there is any good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put to. It is also the Complainant's evidence that the Respondent could not have registered the disputed domain name without prior knowledge of the Complainant's mark as the Respondent's name has no connection with the Complainant's NOVARTIS mark which was registered long ago. This is another indicator of bad faith on the part of the Respondent (see Boursorama SA v. Estrade Nicolas, WIPO Case No. D2017-1463).

The Respondent did not submit a Response in this proceeding which is a further indication of the Respondent's bad faith, which was considered by the Panel.

The Complainant submitted evidence that it had issued a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent through the Registrar as the Respondent's information was hidden behind a privacy shield. The Complainant did not receive a response from the Respondent. This is yet another indication of bad faith by the Respondent.

Based on the particular circumstances of the present case, the Panel also draws an adverse inference from the Respondent's use of privacy shield to hide its identity which is another indication of the Respondent's bad faith.

Based on the evidence presented to the Panel, including the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's mark, the fact that the disputed domain name was used to host a parked page comprising PPC links and the

fact that no Response was submitted by the Respondent in response to the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter and to the Complaint, the Panel draws the inference that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

---

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

---

AND THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME(S) IS (ARE) TO BE

1. **PATIENTNOVARTISONCOLOGY.COM**: Transferred
- 

## PANELLISTS

Name	<b>Mr. Jonathan Agmon</b>
------	---------------------------

---

DATE OF PANEL DECISION **2021-11-24**

---

Publish the Decision

---