

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Haleon UK IP Limited v. Truehost Cloud, Truehostcloud LTD; Ifakayode Marvellous, Fimgohost Web Hosting  
Case No. D2025-1648

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Haleon UK IP Limited, United Kingdom, represented by SafeNames Ltd., United Kingdom.

The Respondents are Truehost Cloud, Truehostcloud LTD, Kenya, and Ifakayode Marvellous, Fimgohost Web Hosting, Nigeria.

### **2. The Domain Names and Registrars**

The disputed domain name <haleon-capital.com> is registered with Global Domain Group LLC (the “Registrar”).

The disputed domain name <haleoncapital.com> is registered with Cosmotown, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 24, 2025. On April 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On April 27 and April 28, 2025, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from one of the named Respondents (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, Global Domain Group Privacy Service) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 28, 2025, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all the disputed domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on May 2, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and in accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 27, 2025. Between May 9 and May 11, 2025, the Center received email communications from “fimgohost.com” (“Fimgohost”), who appears to be the listed registrant for the disputed domain name <haleon-capital.com>, indicating that they had notified the registrant of the dispute and did not hear from the registrant and had suspend the disputed domain name and associated website. Between May 17 and June 5, 2025, the Center received email communications from Truehost Cloud, Truehostcloud LTD (“Truehost”), who appears to claim to have registered one of the disputed domain names <haleoncapital.com> on behalf of its client. The Respondents did not submit any formal response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on May 28, 2025.

The Center appointed Fabrizio Bedarida as the sole panelist in this matter on June 4, 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**

The Complainant in this administrative proceeding, Haleon UK IP Limited, formerly GlaxoSmithKline (“GSK”) Consumer Healthcare (UK) IP Limited, is a British multinational consumer healthcare company established in July 2022 as a corporate spin-off from GSK plc. The Complainant is one of the world’s largest consumer healthcare companies. The Complainant reported revenues of GBP 11.3 billion in 2023, and its products are available to individuals in more than 100 countries, covering both developed and emerging markets. The Complainant has more than 25,000 employees.

GSK plc publicly announced the launch of the Complainant, under the Haleon name, on February 22, 2022. The completion of the demerger and listing of the Complainant’s shares on the London Stock Exchange took place in July 2022. Worldwide media thoroughly covered the announcement of the “Haleon” brand on its launch date, including internationally renowned publications.

The Complainant has a number of registrations for the HALEON trademark around the world. The Complainant is, inter alia, the owner of the following:

- United Kingdom trademark registration number UK00003726732 for the HALEON (word) trademark registered on March 11, 2022, covering goods and services in classes 3, 5, 9, 10, 21, 29, 30, 32, 35, 36, 41, 42, and 44;
- International trademark registration number 1674572 for the HALEON (word) trademark registered on November 29, 2021, covering goods and services in classes 3, 5, 9, 10, 21, 29, 30, 32, 35, 36, 41, 42, and 44; and
- Mexican trademark registration number 2355199 for the HALEON (word) trademark registered on February 10, 2022, covering services in class 36.

The Complainant also has a brand presence online and operates from its primary website at “www.haleon.com”. According to “similarweb.com”, the Complainant’s primary website has received an average of more than 313,000 visits over the three-month period from October 2024 to December 2024.

Finally, the Complainant submits that Haleon UK Capital plc is a qualified reporting UK subsidiary of Haleon plc, the parent company of the group.

The disputed domain names <haleoncapital.com> and <haleon-capital.com> were registered on February 3, 2025, and March 17, 2025, respectively.

The disputed domain names currently resolve to inactive sites. However, from the submissions provided by the Complainant, it appears the Respondents had previously used the disputed domain names to host, at different times, identical websites purporting to be an investment management firm and offering access to a trading platform. It further appears that the website previously hosted on the disputed domain name <haleoncapital.com> and then hosted on the disputed domain name <haleon-capital.com> included the HALEON trademark and a registration page encouraging Internet users to enter sensitive information, such as their full name, username, password, and email address. Both sites used the same website layout, the same logo, and allegedly offered the same services. The postal addresses listed on the sites are identical. Moreover, on the website at the disputed domain name <haleon-capital.com>, the email address listed under the “Contact Info” section is [...]@haleoncapital.com, which corresponds to the other disputed domain name <haleoncapital.com>.

The Complainant’s representatives sent a cease-and-desist letter to the registrant of the disputed domain name <haleoncapital.com> on March 4, 2025, which remains unanswered.

## **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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the HALEON trademark, that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names, and particularly that it is implausible that the Respondents were unaware of the Complainant’s renowned trademark when they registered the disputed domain names. The Complainant further stresses that the second disputed domain name, <haleon-capital.com>, was registered subsequent to one of the Respondents receiving the Complainant’s cease-and-desist letter concerning <haleoncapital.com> on March 4, 2025. Lastly, the Complainant submits that the Respondents intended to confuse Internet users by using the Complainant’s HALEON trademark to increase site traffic and commercially benefit from obtaining personal information from the registration page found on the sites, where the Respondents purport to offer investment services.

Regarding the Respondents’ identity, the Complainant has requested a consolidation of multiple disputed domain names and the Respondents.

### **B. Respondents**

The Respondents did not formally reply to the Complainant’s contentions. Several email communications were received from Truehost, who appears to claim to have registered the disputed domain name <haleoncapital.com> for its client, and was willing to transfer this disputed domain name. The Center also received email communications from Fimgohost, who appears to be the listed registrant for the disputed domain name <haleon-capital.com>, indicating that they had notified the registrant of the dispute and did not hear from the registrant and had suspend the disputed domain name and associated website.

## 6. Discussion and Findings

### 6.1 Respondents' Identity

The Center received several email communications from Truehost, who stated that “we only provided services for haleoncapital.com” and “Regarding the issues of ownership and copyright infringement, we attempted to contact the registrant but did not receive any response”. The Center also received email communications from Fimgohost, who appears to be the listed registrant for the disputed domain name <haleon-capital.com>, indicating that “This is to inform you that following our previous acknowledgment of the domain dispute notification regarding [haleon-capital.com, haleoncapital.com], we took immediate steps to notify the registrant and forwarded all relevant documents as received”, “The registrant was given a 24-hour deadline to either remove the disputed domain or eliminate any infringing content. Unfortunately, we did not receive any response or compliance from the registrant within the stipulated timeframe” and “As a result, we have proceeded to suspend the domain and associated website from our end”. Therefore, Truehost and Fimgohost appear to have claimed that the disputed domain names were registered by someone else (potentially the “beneficial holders”) using their services.

The Panel notes that paragraph 1 of the Rules defines the Respondent as “the holder of a domain-name registration against which a complaint is initiated”. According to the Registrars, the registrant of the disputed domain name <haleoncapital.com> is Truehost Cloud, Truehostcloud LTD, and the registrant of the disputed domain name <haleon-capital.com> is Ifakayode Marvellous, Fimgohost Web Hosting. Truehost and Fimgohost did not reveal the name of the beneficial holders who used their services to register the disputed domain names, but confirmed to the Center that the beneficial holders had been notified of the current proceeding.

Considering (i) the names of the beneficial holders are not disclosed, (ii) the beneficial holders did not submit any response, and (iii) there is no evidence on the existence and nature of any relationship between Truehost and Fimgohost and the beneficial holders, the Panel finds that the circumstances of this proceeding does not allow the Panel to consider that the beneficial holders should be treated as further Respondents.

Therefore, the Panel has decided to only consider Truehost Cloud, Truehostcloud LTD and Ifakayode Marvellous, Fimgohost Web Hosting as the Respondents in this case.

### 6.2 Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules, mainly for the reasons below:

- 1) the disputed domain names at different times resolved to identical websites purporting to be an investment management firm and offering access to a trading platform. Both sites used the same website layout, the same logo, and allegedly offered the same services;
- 2) the postal addresses listed on the sites are identical;
- 3) on the disputed domain name <haleon-capital.com>, the email address listed under the “Contact info” section is [...]@haleoncapital.com, which corresponds to the disputed domain name <haleoncapital.com>;
- 4) the disputed domain names were created within approximately six weeks of each other;
- 5) the disputed domain name <haleon-capital.com> was created on March 17, 2025 after the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter to the registrant of the disputed domain name <haleoncapital.com> on March 4, 2025, and resolved to an identical website that was displayed on the website at the disputed domain name <haleoncapital.com>;

6) the disputed domain names share a highly analogous composition encompassing the HALEON trademark and the term “capital”, which shows a clear naming pattern; the only difference is that the later registered disputed domain name <haleon-capital.com> includes a hyphen (“-”) separating the two terms; and

7) consolidation of the proceedings would be fair and equitable to all Parties.

The registrants of the disputed domain names did not comment on the Complainant’s request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant’s request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the above indicated arguments (which represent only some of those enumerated by the Complainant) are sufficient for a finding that the disputed domain names identified in the Complaint are, on the balance of probability, under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as “the Respondent”) in a single proceeding.

### **6.3 Substantive Issues**

In order for the Complainant to obtain a transfer of the disputed domain names, paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainant must demonstrate to the Panel that:

- (i) the disputed domain names are 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 names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used 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 names. [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 Panel finds the mark is incorporated entirely and is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of the other terms, here “capital” and a hyphen (“-”), may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent, irrespective of whether there is a beneficial holder, lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Based on the available record, 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 the Respondent, irrespective of whether there is a beneficial holder, was aware of the Complainant’s trademark registrations and rights to the HALEON trademark when it registered the disputed domain names. The HALEON term is a coined amalgamation of an old English word “Hale”, meaning “in good health”, and “Leon”, which is associated with the word “strength”. It is therefore a distinctive, non-dictionary term. The disputed domain names contain, without any authorization or approval, the Complainant’s registered HALEON trademarks in its entirety, and this is the only distinctive component of the disputed domain names. The disputed domain names were registered three years after the Complainant’s trademarks were registered. Further, the composition of the disputed domain names is also similar to the Complainant’s subsidiary, Haleon UK Capital plc. Therefore, it is more likely than not that the Respondent, irrespective of whether there is a beneficial holder, had knowledge of the Complainant’s earlier rights to the HALEON trademark and trade name and targeted those when the disputed domain names were registered.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Further inference of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain names is given by the facts that: one of the disputed domain names was registered through a privacy service; the Complainant’s cease-and-desist letter concerning the disputed domain name <haleoncapital.com> sent on March 4, 2025 was unanswered but the disputed domain name <haleon-capital.com> was registered on March 17, 2025 resolving to an identical website that was previously hosted on the disputed domain name <haleoncapital.com>, and there is no formal response in the present proceeding.

The disputed domain names at different times resolved to an identical website, purporting to be an investment management firm and offering access to a trading platform. Furthermore, according to the non-

rebutted assertions of the Complainant and evidence provided by the Complainant, the website displayed a forged company certificate documentation in an attempt to represent itself as a legitimate investment management company, and that some of the content displayed on the website was copied from other third-party websites.

The disputed domain names do not resolve to any active website now. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or “coming soon” page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. Panels will look at the totality of the circumstances in each case, factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant’s mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, and (iii) the respondent’s concealing its identity or use of false contact details (noted to be in breach of its registration agreement).

[WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, the composition of the disputed domain names, the use of the privacy service in registering one of the disputed domain names and their previous use, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

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 names <haleon-capital.com> and <haleoncapital.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Fabrizio Bedarida/*

**Fabrizio Bedarida**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 18, 2025