Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107799

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107799
Time of filing	2025-07-30 07:14:44
Domain names	teva.life

Case administrator

Organization	Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd.

Complainant representative

Organization	SILKA AB

Respondent

Organization	Domain Name Privacy Inc

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

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

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant has adduced evidence of owning the following trademarks:

1. US trademark, No. 1567918 for TEVA (word mark), registered on 28 November 1989 in Nice Classification class 5;
2. UK trademark No. UK00001369112 for TEVA (word mark), registered on 17 August 1990 in class 5;
3. EU trademark No. 000115394 for TEVA (figurative mark), registered on 29 April 1998 in class 5;
4. EU trademark No. 007257611 for TEVA (figurative mark), registered on 4 August 2009 in classes 1, 3, 5, 10, 31 and 42;
5. International trademark No. 1319184 for TEVA (figurative mark), registered on 15 June 2016 in classes 5, 10 and 42;
6. Chinese trademark No. 35793165 for TEVA (word mark), registered on 14 September 2019 in class 44;
7. US trademark No. 6704380 TEVA (figurative mark), registered on 19 April 2022 in class 35.

The Complainant added to this evidence indications of further trademarks it holds.

It also provided some screenshot evidence indicating that the Complainant has a connection with the domain name <tevalife.hu>, but the Panel found that no legal connection with the Complainant is substantiated by the details provided (see Factual Background), which appear to relate to another entity.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name <teva.life> on 12 July 2025 according to the Registrar Verification obtained by the CAC Case Administrator.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant was incorporated in Israel on 13 February 1944 and is the successor to earlier companies dating back to 1901. It is today a global pharmaceutical company that delivers healthcare solutions used by millions of patients daily and is one of the world's largest generic medicines producers on the basis of 3,600 different products spanning most therapeutic areas. According to the Complainant's 2024 annual report, the Complainant is active in 57 countries and had revenues of more than $16.5 billion with approximately 37,000 employees internationally.

The Complainant (as noted under Identification of Rights) claimed with screenshot evidence that it has a connection with the domain name <tevalife.hu>, though it is not the registrant. The screenshots provided show -- despite the obscurity of the relationship to the entity operating the website to which it resolves -- use of the Complainant's online marketing material combined with text in Hungarian. The contentions made by the Complainant indicate that such use is legitimate (and references to it are thus phrased as such under Parties' Contentions).

The Complainant further submitted screenshots showing that the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page. That page features the linked name of other well-known pharmaceutical companies and contains another link to the parking service provider's website, at which the disputed domain name <teva.life> is declared as being for sale at a price of $2,888.

Another screenshot relates to an MX (mail server) check performed by the Complainant on the disputed domain name. It contains some indication that NS (name server) servers may have been activated.

Remaining screenshots offered to the Panel by the Complainant relate to the fruits of online searches performed by the Complainant. In view of their poor probative value, the Panel noted them without further consideration.

For its part, the Registrar Verification revealed that the Respondent's contact details given on registration are clearly inaccurate because they simply repeat those of a WHOIS privacy services provider employed by domain name registrants -- including whoever the Respondent actually is in this proceeding.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

1. The Complainant's rights and the disputed domain name

The disputed domain name incorporates the entirety of the Complainant's well-known TEVA mark without any other element, except the <.life> TLD extension. Hence, it can be concluded that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark

2. The Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interest

The Respondent lacks any right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name. None of the factors indicated in the Policy that might substantiate a right or legitimate interest in favour of the Respondent is evident in the circumstances of this proceeding. Nor has the Respondent received any authorization from the Complainant to use its trademarked brand. Instead, the disputed domain name is put to illegitimate use, as evidenced by the screenshots furnished of the website to which it resolves. These show that the disputed domain name resolves to a "pay-per-click" (PPC) website, displaying hyperlinks related to the pharmaceutical industry, in which the Complainant is well-known, for the purpose of generating PPC revenues. The Complainant also notes that some of those hyperlinks are related to the Complainant's competitors like Novartis or Eli Lilly. It is further relevant how similar the disputed domain name is to the (legitimately used) domain name <tevalife.hu>

The above factors amount to a prima facie case against the Respondent on this point.

3. The Respondent's bad faith

In the Complainant's view, there are several circumstances to establish that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith:

- The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's well-known TEVA mark in full, without the consent or authorization of the Complainant.
- The disputed domain name was registered on 12 July 2025, whereas the Complainant's TEVA mark has been registered internationally for many years. Hence, the notoriety of the Complainant and of its well-known TEVA mark makes it implausible that the Respondent could have been unaware of them when the disputed domain name was registered.
- Moreover, a simple search in an online trademark register or in the Google search engine would have informed the Respondent of the existence of the Complainant and its rights in TEVA.
- Furthermore, considering a) that internet users will commonly associate the disputed domain name with the Complainant and b) that name's great similarity to the legitimately used domain name <tevalife.hu>, it is impossible to believe that the Respondent would have chosen the disputed domain name if it did not have the Complainant's TEVA mark and the Complainant's activities in

mind.

As to bad-faith use, the PPC use explained above is a clear indication that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, internet users to its own website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's TEVA trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of said website. This constitutes bad faith use in the terms of the Policy. As to a further instance of what amounts to bad faith mentioned in the Policy, the Complainant draws the Panel's attention to the fact that the disputed domain name is being offered for sale at $2,888.

The Complainant invokes its online search results and the activation of mail servers for the disputed domain name as further indications of bad faith at play, particularly in the latter case through spamming or phishing.

RESPONDENT:

NO ADMINISTRATIVELY COMPLIANT RESPONSE HAS BEEN FILED.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to trademarks 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 that 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 the UDRP were met and that there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

The Panel notes that its résumé of the Parties' contentions includes for the Complainant only its arguments pertinent to reaching a decision in this administrative proceeding; it omits in particular references made in the Complaint to several past ADR Panels' Decisions.

Lastly, the Panel notes the Complainant's invitation to the Panel to regard its submissions concerning the Respondent's lack of rights or of a legitimate interest as being adequate to constitute a prima facie case and thereby to shift the burden of proof to the Respondent. The Panel does not accept this invitation on the grounds of redundancy in face of the circumstances. The Panel recommends instead close attention to the actual facts of the proceeding and their probative value.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

This case involves a Respondent that, contrary to ICANN requirements reflected in registrant agreements generally, has given completely inaccurate information about itself, presumably to conceal its identity. The Respondent has done so when registering and subsequently using the disputed domain name, a name composed by reproducing, identically, the Complainant's trademark-protected brand in the name's stem combined with the TLD extension <.life>, which serves, among others, entities connected with healthcare and life sciences -- a business sphere that necessarily includes that of a major pharmaceutical company like the Complainant. There is no question of a legitimate use in these circumstances on the Respondent's part. To the contrary, it is immediately transparent from the circumstances that registration and use of the disputed domain name has been performed illegitimately and deliberately. Partly this consists in of an attempt to sell the disputed domain name for gain, at a price that one must assume is inflated due to, and thus wrongly trading on, the perceived value of the Complainant's brand. But, beyond this, phishing and spamming, again through wrongly exploiting the Complainant's rights, is not improbable in this situation -- especially considering the Respondent's concealed identity. Bad faith indeed pervades the Respondent's scheme.

The Panel, for these reasons, FINDS that all requirements of the Policy's cumulative three-part test are clearly met in this case and

ORDERS transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

For the record, the Panel remarks that in its reasoning it did not give any weight to the Complainant's contention regarding a need to conduct prior searches before registration.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **teva.life**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Kevin Madders**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-09-10

Publish the Decision