

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Juniper Networks, Inc. v. James Walker
Case No. D2025-1622

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Juniper Networks, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Hanson Bridgett LLP, United States.

The Respondent is James Walker, Canada.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <junipernetworks.bio> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 25, 2025. On April 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On April 25, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Disputed Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (“Redacted”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 28, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on April 29, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 5, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 25, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 26, 2025.

The Center appointed Gabriela Kennedy as the sole panelist in this matter on May 28, 2025. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

Founded in 1996, the Complainant is one of the global leaders in development and marketing of customized networking hardware and software and related goods and services. The Complainant delivers networking technology to its customers, including network operators, telecommunication and cloud providers, enterprises like manufacturers, financial services providers, hospital groups, school districts, retail franchises, and universities.

The Complainant provides networking hardware including advanced, enterprise-grade routers, switches, network access points, and gateways. The Complainant's software includes systems such as Junos, Marvis, and Mist, which provide advanced, AI-driven control and monitoring of customer networks.

The Complainant owns various word and figurative trademarks for the JUNIPER NETWORKS mark. The relevant trademark registrations include, inter alia, the United States Trademark Registration No. 7615656 for JUNIPER NETWORKS in Classes 9, 37, 41, and 42 registered on December 17, 2024, the United States Trademark Registration No. 4118939 for  in Classes 9, 37, 41, and 42 registered on March 27, 2012 (the "Complainant's Trademark").

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on April 12, 2025, many years after the Complainant first registered the Complainant's Trademark. At the time of the filing of the Complaint and the rendering of this Decision, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to a parking page displaying pay-per-click ("PPC") advertising links that redirect to websites promoting businesses similar to that of the Complainant as well as other third-party commercial services unrelated to the Complainant's businesses (the "Respondent's Website").

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

- (a) The Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's Trademark. The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's Trademark in its entirety. The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".bio" can be disregarded in assessing confusing similarity under the first element.
- (b) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the name "Juniper". There is no affiliation whatsoever between the Complainant and the Respondent and the Complainant has never licensed or permitted the Respondent to use the Complainant's Trademark in any manner. The Respondent's Website appears to be a parking page which displays click through links to other commercial websites, including websites of the Complainant's competitors. As such, the Respondent's actions do not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services and instead appear to be an attempt to capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant's Trademark.
- (c) The Respondent has registered the Disputed Domain Name and is using it in bad faith. The Respondent registered and used the Disputed Domain Name in a deliberate attempt to deceive third parties

as to Respondent's identity or connection with the Complainant by operating a link-tree farm at the Disputed Domain Name in an effort to divert Internet users to other third-party websites. The Respondent aims to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement for the Respondent's own commercial gain.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove each of the following three elements:

- (i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; 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 by the Respondent in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's Trademark and the Disputed Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Complainant's Trademark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Furthermore, the gTLD in this case ".bio" may be disregarded for the purposes of assessing confusing similarity under the first element. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the Complainant's Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a Disputed Domain Name.

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 (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

In the present case, the Respondent did not submit a Response. The fact that the Respondent did not submit a Response does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant. However, the Respondent's failure to file a Response may result in the Panel drawing appropriate inferences from such default. The Panel may also accept all reasonable and supported allegations and inferences flowing from the Complainant as true (see *Entertainment Shopping AG v. Nischal Soni, Sonik Technologies*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1437](#); and *Charles Jourdan Holding AG v. AAIM*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0403](#)).

The Panel notes that there is no evidence on the available record to show that the Respondent has trademark rights corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name, or that the Respondent has become commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. The Panel further notes that the Complainant has provided no license or authorization of any kind to the Respondent to use the Complainant's Trademark or to apply for or use any domain name incorporating the Complainant's Trademark. The Respondent would likely not have adopted the Complainant's Trademark if not for the purpose of creating an impression that the Disputed Domain Name is associated with, or originates from, the Complainant noting the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's Trademark save for the gTLD.

Whilst the Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name to host a parked page comprising PPC links, this does not of itself confer rights or legitimate interests arising from a "bona fide offering of goods or services" or from "legitimate noncommercial or fair use" of the Disputed Domain Name, specially taking into account that such links compete with and capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant's Trademark (see *Virgin Enterprises Limited v. LINYANXIAO aka lin yanxiao*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-2302](#) and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9).

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that it is difficult to conceive of any plausible use of the Disputed Domain Name by the unaffiliated Respondent that would amount to good faith use, given that the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's Trademark in its entirety, and the Respondent's Website incorporates PPC links to third-party websites, including websites promoting businesses that are similar to or competing with that of the Complainant. While the intention to earn commercial revenue from PPC links is not in and of itself evidence of bad faith, previous panels have found that the use of a domain name deceptively similar to a complainant's trademark to obtain click-through revenue supports a finding of bad faith use (see *VKR Holding A/S v. Wu Yu*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-0744](#)). Given that the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's Trademark in its entirety, the Panel therefore finds it difficult to conceive that the Respondent is not using the Disputed Domain Name to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's Website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the Respondent's Website. Further, the Respondent failed to respond to the Complainant's contentions and has provided no evidence of any actual or contemplated good faith use of the Disputed Domain Name. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and used the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the Disputed Domain Name <junipernetworks.bio> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gabriela Kennedy/

Gabriela Kennedy

Sole Panelist

Date: June 12, 2025