

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Virbac S.A. v. YIWEI REN

Case No. DME2025-0014

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Virbac S.A., France, represented by Nameshield, France.

The Respondent is YIWEI REN, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <virbac.me> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 6, 2025. On June 6, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same day, 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 June 10, 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 amended Complaint on the same day.

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 11, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 1, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 9, 2025.

The Center appointed Mladen Vukmir as the sole panelist in this matter on July 24, 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 is a French company, founded in 1968. It develops and sells a wide range of vaccines and medicines used in the prevention and treatment of diseases in both companion and food-producing animals.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous VIRBAC trademarks registered in various jurisdictions, including VIRBAC (figurative) International Registration number 420254, registered on December 15, 1975, for goods in class 5 of International Classification ("IC"), and VIRBAC (figurative) International Registration number 793769, registered on March 11, 2002, for goods and services in classes 5, 38, 42, and 44 of IC ("VIRBAC trademark").

The Complainant is the owner of the domain name <virbac.com>, registered on January 15, 2000. The Complainant's domain name serves as the official website of the Complainant and is used to promote the Complainant's products and provide information about its services.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 2, 2024, and it redirects to a website where it is offered for sale for USD 1,450.

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

(i) the Complainant is a long-established French company, ranking as the sixth largest animal health company in the world with operations in over 100 countries and more than 4,900 employees, with a turnover of EUR 869 million in 2018.

(ii) the disputed domain name is identical to its registered and widely known VIRBAC trademark, as it incorporates the VIRBAC trademark in its entirety without addition or deletion.

(iii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name as the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, is not affiliated with nor authorized by the Complainant in any way. The Respondent is not related in any way to the Complainant's business. Neither license nor authorization has been granted to the Respondent to make any use of the Complainant's VIRBAC trademark. The disputed domain name is listed for sale for USD 1,450, which is evidence of the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interest.

(iv) the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's well-known VIRBAC trademark. The Complainant has established a strong reputation while using its VIRBAC trademark which has no meaning except in relation to the Complainant. Given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's VIRBAC trademark it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's VIRBAC trademark and with the Complainant in mind. The disputed domain name is not being actively used and is instead offered for sale for USD 1,450, further evidencing that the Respondent's intent was to profit from the Complainant's VIRBAC trademark, which constitutes bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Complainant's VIRBAC trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. The country code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".me" is a standard registration requirement and as such may be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) section 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the 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.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its VIRBAC trademark, whether through license, affiliation, or otherwise. The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's VIRBAC trademark. The Panel notes that the Respondent is not commonly known by the word "virbac" which has no apparent meaning or significance beyond its reference to the Complainant.

The Respondent has not filed a Response and has provided no explanation or evidence demonstrating any rights or legitimate interests under any of the circumstances enumerated in the Policy or otherwise. The Respondent has not submitted any evidence of a bona fide offering of goods or services, or of any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

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.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name years after the Complainant had obtained trademark protection for the VIRBAC trademark and established substantial goodwill and reputation in that trademark. The disputed domain name redirects to a website where it is offered for sale for USD 1,450.

Having in mind the circumstances and evidence presented, the Panel finds the Complainant's VIRBAC trademark to be distinctive and well-known. The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's distinctive and fanciful mark, which has no apparent meaning or generic significance beyond its association with the Complainant. The Complainant has provided evidence showing that online search results for "virbac" relate almost exclusively to its business, further underscoring VIRBAC trademark's uniqueness and public recognition. In these circumstances, the Panel finds it unlikely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without prior knowledge of the Complainant's rights and reputation.

Since its registration the disputed domain name has been offered for sale at USD 1,450. Offering to sell the disputed domain name which is identical to the Complainant's trademark and almost identical to the Complainant's domain name <virbac.com>, at such a price which is likely in excess of the documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name, can demonstrate bad faith under the circumstances described at paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

Although the disputed domain name is not entirely inactive, the use of a domain name to redirect to a website which does nothing other than offer it for sale, is essentially the same as passive holding. The disputed domain name has remained unused in any active, substantive way. There is no content, branding, or indication of any business activity connected to the disputed domain name. This absence of any genuine use is particularly significant given that the disputed domain name is identical to a highly distinctive and well-established VIRBAC trademark belonging to the Complainant.

In applying the passive holding doctrine, panels will look at the totality of the circumstances in each case, and factors that have been considered relevant 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, (iii) the respondent's concealing its identity or use of false contact details, and (iv) the implausibility of any good faith use to which the domain name may be put. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's VIRBAC trademark. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name which is identical to the Complainant's VIRBAC trademark and gives the false impression that the disputed domain name is associated with the Complainant, known in the market as VIRBAC. The Respondent's provision of what appears to be false or incomplete contact details to conceal its identity (the courier service was not able to deliver the Written Notice due to bad address), and the passive holding of the disputed domain name, no evidence of any good-faith use, reinforce the conclusion of bad faith. It is not possible to conceive of any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent that would not be illegitimate or infringe the Complainant's trademark rights. The Panel draws adverse inferences from the

Respondent's failure to take part in the present proceeding where an explanation is certainly called for. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.3.

Moreover, the Complainant owns the domain name <virbac.com> that serves as the official website of the Complainant. The disputed domain name is almost identical to the Complainant's domain name, so the impression is that the Complainant owns or manages the disputed domain name.

Taken together, these facts support a finding that the Respondent both registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraphs 4(a)(iii) and 4(b)(i).

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 <virbac.me> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mladen Vukmir/

Mladen Vukmir

Sole Panelist

Date: August 7, 2025