

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-109006

Case number CAC-UDRP-109006

Time of filing 2026-09-17 09:39:52

Domain names tevapharma.bio

Case administrator

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

Complainant

Organization Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd.

Complainant representative

Organization SILKA AB

Respondent

Organization Netlify Inc

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 owns several "TEVA" and "TEVAPHARM" trademarks, registered worldwide, such as:

Trademark	Jurisdiction	Registration Number	Registration Date	Class(es) Covered
TEVA [Device]	International	1319184	15 June 2016	5, 10, 42
TEVA [Device]	European Union	000115394	29 April 1998	5
TEVA	United States	1567918	28 November 1989	5

TEVA	European Union	007258081	3 January 2011	1, 3, 5, 10, 42
TEVA	Israel	41075	5 July 1977	5
TEVAPHARM	United Kingdom	UK00003577956	21 May 2021	5, 44
TEVAPHARM	European Union	018285645	9 January 2021	5, 44
TEVAPHARM	Denmark	VR 2011 02130	31 August 2011	5, 10, 35
TEVAPHARMA (Official database does not provide a direct link to the trademark registration)	Chile	1280482	31 Jan 2017 (Filing date)	5, 44

(hereinafter cumulatively referred to as the "Trademark").

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is an international pharmaceutical company focused on advancing healthcare through the development, manufacture, and supply of high-quality medicinal products and healthcare solutions. Established in Israel on February 13, 1944, through the consolidation of several pharmaceutical enterprises, including one founded in 1901, the Complainant has grown into one of the world's foremost producers of generic medicines. Its activities encompass the research, development, production, and commercialization of innovative therapies, generic drugs, and biosimilar products designed to meet the healthcare needs of patients worldwide. In 2025, the Complainant reported revenues of approximately USD 17.3 billion across 57 markets, operated 30 manufacturing facilities, and employed approximately 34,000 individuals globally.

The disputed domain name <tevapharma.bio> was registered on August 22, 2026 and resolves to a website that falsely presents itself as being associated with the Complaint, and provides e-mail addresses purportedly belonging to executives of the Complainant for business communications.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In this regard, the Complainant states that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, that it is not affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant in any way, that the Complainant does not carry out any activity for, nor has any business with the Respondent, and that neither license nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Trademark or apply for registration of the disputed domain name by the Complainant.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It contends that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its Trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, as the Trademark is well-known. Further, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name is evidence of bad faith, as it is a deliberate attempt to exploit the reputation attached to the Trademark and to create confusion among Internet users as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website.

RESPONDENT:

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

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the following three elements is present:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

1. The Panel accepts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trademark, as it incorporates the Trademark in its entirety. The mere addition of the letter "a", which even then forms the word "pharma" does not alter the finding of confusing similarity.

2. Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element.

The Respondent does not appear to have operated any bona fide or legitimate business under the disputed domain name and is not making a noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Instead, the disputed domain name has been used to create a false association with the Complainant and by providing e-mail addresses purportedly belonging to executives of the Complainant for business communications, Respondent creates a significant risk of phishing, fraud, and other deceptive conduct. The use of the disputed domain name in such a manner clearly demonstrates that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Complainant has fulfilled its obligations under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy. The Respondent did not deny these assertions in any way and therefore failed to prove any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

3.1 The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant and its rights in the Trademark, as the Trademark is well-established and well-known.

3.2 Furthermore, the Panel accepts the Complainant's contentions that the disputed domain name has been used in bad faith under para. 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Respondent has used the disputed domain to intentionally attract Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and by capitalising on Complainant's reputation.

Consequently, by using the disputed domain name in such a manner, the Respondent has fulfilled the elements and requirements for a finding under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. The Panel finds that the Complainant has also established the third element of the Policy successfully.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

- 1. **tevapharma.bio**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Stefanie Efstathiou LL.M. mult.
------	---------------------------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-10-14

Publish the Decision