Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108526

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108526
Time of filing	2026-03-25 12:52:32
Domain names	tevapharm.bio

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization	Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd.

Complainant representative

Organization	SILKA AB

Respondent

Name	Jenske Lipski

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 holds a substantial portfolio of TEVA-formative trademarks (including TEVAPHARM) registered across numerous countries and jurisdictions worldwide. By way of example, the Complainant owns trademark registrations for TEVA and TEVAPHARM in the UK and EU, at least. Complainant provides extracts from the official registers as evidence.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, a global pharmaceutical company focused on delivering healthcare solutions since 1944. As stated in its 2024 annual report, the company generated revenues exceeding USD 16.5 billion, and employed around 37,000 people worldwide. Complainant established its online presence under the domain name <tevapharm.com>, registered in 1996 and in use by the Complainant for over 25 years, through which it provides information about its business and its corporate history, and which is used to generate corporate e-mail accounts.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 10, 2026 and resolves to a Registrar’s parking site offering advertising through use of Complainant's marks. There is no evidence that the Respondent otherwise has used the disputed domain name since its registration.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it.

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). Complainant has established its trademark rights in the TEVA and TEVAPHARM marks for purposes of standing in this proceeding. Since the disputed domain name contains the TEVA and TEVAPHARM marks in their entirety within the disputed domain name, they are identical or confusingly similar for purposes of the first element of the Policy. The TLD offers no potential distinctiveness in this case.

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). The Complainant states that Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, and it has not received any consent, permission, authorization or acquiescence from the Complainant to use its TEVA and TEVAPHARM marks in association with the registration of the disputed domain name. There is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent holds any trademark rights on “tevapharm.bio” or “tevapharm”, or otherwise is known by such name(s). There is no evidence that the Respondent is making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

The Complainant considers it highly improbable that the Respondent intended or intends to use the disputed domain name for any legitimate or fair purpose. Moreover, the Complainant is unable to identify any plausible use of the disputed domain name that would not infringe upon its rights in the well-known TEVA and TEVAPHARM marks. The Panel shares these assumptions. As Respondent has not appeared to rebut the Complainant's allegations, the Panel finds that Complainant has met its burden under this element 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). Considering that the disputed domain name comprises the Complainant’s distinctive TEVA and TEVAPHARM marks in full, it is difficult to believe that the Respondent would have chosen the disputed domain name if it did not have the Complainant’s marks and activities in mind. Since the disputed domain name reproduces in full the TEVA and TEVAPHARM marks, uses the TLD “.bio” (the Complainant being a manufacturer of biosimilar products) and it is almost identical to the domain name <tevapharm.com>, under which the Complainant operates its online presence, it can be concluded that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, in order to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its TEVA and TEVAPHARM marks.

In view of all the above, the Complainant contends that the Respondent’s passive holding of the disputed domain name has the characteristics which are associated with bad faith registration and use, as set out at WIPO Overview 3.1, Sec. 3.1 and 3.3.

- The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant’s TEVA and TEVAPHARM marks in their entirety.
- Internet users commonly associate “tevapharm” with the Complainant and its products. Indeed, the Complainant’s TEVA and TEVAPHARM marks have been considered as well-known by previous UDRP panels.
- Having regard to the common association of “tevapharm” with the Complainant and the structure of the disputed domain name (almost identical to the Complainant’s domain name <tevapharm.com>, under which the Complainant operates its online presence), it is impossible to think of any good faith use to which the disputed domain name could be put by the Respondent.

The Complainant further proves that MX servers are configured for the disputed domain name, indicating a risk that the Respondent may use the disputed domain name to create an e-mail address with the suffix “@tevapharm.bio” for deceptive purposes. This is further confirmed by the fact that the disputed domain name currently has the subdomain “email.tevapharm.bio” configured. This constitutes additional evidence of bad faith registration and use, sufficient for this Panel to find that this element of the Policy has

been satisfied.

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

The disputed domain name has no plausible good faith use, and high probability to be used for nefarious purposes.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **tevapharm.bio**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Mike Rodenbaugh**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-04-22

Publish the Decision