Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107466

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107466
Time of filing	2025-12-19 11:01:26
Domain names	schizophreniauzedyrisperidonetreatment.online

Case administrator

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

Complainants

Organization	Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd
Organization	Teva Pharmaceuticals Usa, Inc
Organization	Teva Pharmaceuticals International GmbH

Complainant representative

Organization	SILKA AB

Respondent

Organization	NC - WPH Online

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 several national and international trademark registrations for “UZEDY”, including:

- US Trademark Registration no. 7213994 UZEDY, registered on November 7, 2023, in international class 5;
- EUTM Registration no. 018537143 UZEDY, registered on April 28, 2022, in international class 5;
- Swiss Trademark Registration no. 793437 UZEDY, registered on February 17, 2023, in international class 5.

The Complainant also owns the domain names <uzedy.com> and <uzedyhcp.com> since 2021.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant states that it is a leading and internationally recognized pharmaceutical company with a wide range of products

distributed worldwide and used by an estimated 200 million people on a daily basis. Among others, the Complainant manufactures and commercializes "Uzedy", an atypical antipsychotic risperidone indicated for the treatment of schizophrenia in adults.

The Complainant further states that it is the owner of the well-known trademark “UZEDY” since the early 00's and of various domain names, such as the domain name <uzedy.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 20, 2025 and it currently resolves to a parking page with third-party commercial links.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

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.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

PRELIMINARY ISSUE – CONSOLIDATION OF COMPLAINANTS

The Panel notes that the present Complaint has been filed by three Complainants. On this subject, paragraph 4.11.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.0 provides inter alia as follows: "Paragraph 10(e) of the UDRP Rules grants a panel the power to consolidate multiple domain name disputes … In assessing whether a complaint filed by multiple complainants may be brought against a single respondent, panels look at whether (i) the complainants have a specific common grievance against the respondent, or the respondent has engaged in common conduct that has affected the complainants in a similar fashion, and (ii) it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to permit the consolidation."

The Panel is satisfied that Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., and Teva Pharmaceuticals International GmbH are subsidiaries of Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd., and two of them hold trademark registrations for UZEDY in multiple jurisdictions worldwide.

The Panel finds that the Complainants have established that they have a common grievance against Respondent which would affect their individual rights on substantially the same basis. Respondent has not indicated that it would suffer any prejudice from consolidation of the complaints and no potential prejudice is apparent to the Panel. Respondent has not otherwise contested the request for consolidation. Accordingly, the Panel determines that it is procedurally efficient to permit the consolidation and is content that such consolidation is equitable to all Parties.

Hereinafter, the three Complainants are referred to collectively as “Complainant”.

* * *

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).

The disputed domain name <schizophreniauzedyrisperidonetreatment.online> is confusingly similar to the trademark “UZEDY”, as the addition of further descriptive/general verbal elements such as “schizophrenia”, “risperidone” and “treatment”, all of which are linked to UZEDY (a brand name for risperidone) is quite irrelevant and not sufficient to escape such finding; on the contrary, such addition could even increase the confusing similarity.

* * *

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).

According to the WIPO case No. D2003-0455, Croatia Airlines d. d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd., the Complainant is required to make out a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. Once such a prima facie case is made, the Respondent carries the burden of demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the Respondent fails to do so, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied paragraph 4(a) (ii) of the Policy.

In the case at hand, the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant nor authorized by it in any way to use the trademark “UZEDY”. The Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent. The disputed domain name is parked: therefore, the Respondent did not make any use of disputed domain name since its registration, and it confirms that Respondent has no demonstrable plan to use the disputed domain name. It demonstrates a lack of legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent did not provide any reply to the Complaint in order to support its reasons for having registered the disputed domain name.

The Panel believes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests to the disputed domain name <schizophreniauzedyrisperidonetreatment.online>.

* * *

The Panel finds that the Complainant successfully submitted prima facie evidence that the Respondent has made no use of, or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name neither in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor is making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark and reputation, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent has registered the domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark “UZEDY”. See, for instance, WIPO Case No. D2004-0673, Ferrari S.p.A v. American Entertainment Group Inc.

Furthermore, the fact that the disputed domain name still resolves toward a parking page with PPC links clearly demonstrates it is aimed at attracting Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark "UZEDY" as to the sources, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the aforementioned PPC page.

In the absence of real evidence in the merits of the case from the Respondent and given the reputation of the Complainant and its trademarks, the Panel infers that the Respondent had the Complainant's trademarks “UZEDY” in mind when registering the disputed domain name. Consequently, the Panel believes that the same 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. **schizophreniauzedyrisperidonetreatment.online**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Tommaso La Scala**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-01-25

Publish the Decision