

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Neurocrine Biosciences, Inc. v. Bai Xiqing  
Case No. DRO2025-0009

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Neurocrine Biosciences, Inc., United States of America (the “US”), represented by Fross Zelnick Lehrman & Zissu, P.C., US.

The Respondent is Bai Xiqing, China.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registry

The disputed domain name <neurocrine.ro> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with RoTLD (the “Registry”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 24, 2025. On September 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registry a request for registry verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On September 25, 2025, Registry 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 FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 25, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by Registry, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on September 26, and October 1, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 two amended Complaints, and the proceedings commenced on October 3, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 23, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 24, 2025.

The Center appointed Monica Novac as the sole panelist in this matter on October 29, 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 Neurocrine Biosciences, Inc., a US pharmaceutical company established in 1992. The Complainant focuses on discovering and developing pharmaceuticals for the treatment of various diseases and disorders. The Complainant currently employs over 1,900 people and has more than 80,000 followers on the social network LinkedIn.

The Complainant owns a large number of NEUROCRINE trademarks worldwide, including the following:

- US Trademark Registration No. 5762521 NEUROCRINE (word) registered on May 28, 2019, for goods in class 5;
- US Trademark Registration No. 5762522 NEUROCRINE (word) registered on May 28, 2019, for services in class 42;
- US Trademark Registration No. 7093757 NEUROCRINE (word) registered on June 27, 2023, for goods in class 5; and
- International Trademark Registration No. 1468022 NEUROCRINE (word), registered on April 12, 2019, for goods and services in classes 5 and 42, designating several jurisdictions.

The Complainant states that it has been dedicated to discovering and developing medical treatments under the brand NEUROCRINE since its establishment in 1992.

The Complainant also owns several domain names containing its NEUROCRINE brand, including, but not limited to <neurocrine.com>, <neurocrine.asia>, <neurocrine.eu>, <neurocrine.us>, <neurocrine.cn>, <neurocrine.net.cn> and <neurocrine.org.cn>, all these being registered before the date of registration of the Disputed Domain Name.

The Respondent is Bai Xiqing, reportedly located in China. The Disputed Domain Name was registered on October 24, 2023. On the date of filing the Complaint, as well as on the date of this Decision, the Disputed Domain Name redirects to the webpage found at <sedo.com> (i.e. a platform for domain names' trading) where the Disputed Domain Name is offered for sale for EUR 5,999.

The Panel also notes the Complainant's assertions that in December 2024, their lawyer submitted a request via the Registry with a view to contact the Respondent and arrange an online meeting to discuss a potential transfer of the Disputed Domain Name to the Complainant, however the Respondent did not reply. Consequently, the Registry notified the Respondent of its obligation to validate and update its registration details, under the sanction of the suspension, and ultimately, the cancellation of the Disputed Domain Name. On February 18, 2025, the Registry informed the Complainant's lawyer via email that the Respondent positively replied to the validation request and submitted documents attesting the accuracy of the declared registration details.

## 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:

- the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the Complainant's NEUROCRINE trademarks;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name; and
- the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and it is being used in bad faith.

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

According to the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1, the country code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".ro" in the Disputed Domain Name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

The Panel notes that the Disputed Domain Name totally incorporates the Complainant's NEUROCRINE trademark, with no other additions. 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.

Further to all the above, 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 the 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.

It is accepted by the Panel that the Respondent is not related to the Complainant in any way and that the Complainant has never authorized the Respondent to register or use the Disputed Domain Name. Moreover, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. To the Complainant's knowledge, the Respondent is not associated with any business incorporating the NEUROCRINE mark and is not commonly known under this name.

The Panel is of the opinion that the composition of the Disputed Domain Name carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

The Panel notes that there is no evidence of use, or demonstrable preparations to use the Disputed Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. In view of the composition of the Disputed Domain Name, the Panel is of the opinion that the Disputed Domain Name is likely to mislead Internet users, and there is no evidence that the Respondent has been making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name.

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.

Further to all the above, 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 Complainant registered and used its NEUROCRINE trademark long before the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name. Moreover, the Disputed Domain Name was registered on October 24, 2023, i.e. shortly after the Complainant registered multiple domain names containing its NEUROCRINE trademark, between June 16, 2023 and October 20, 2023 (see Exhibit E to the Complaint). In view of the above, the Panel finds it is unlikely that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant's NEUROCRINE trademark and business when registering the Disputed Domain Name.

The Panel is of the opinion that the composition of the Disputed Domain Name falsely suggests Internet users that they will be directed to a website affiliated to the Complainant and related to the Complainant's presence and activity in Romania. The Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name which is identical to the Complainant's trademark creates a false association or affiliation with the Complainant and it is clear proof of the Respondent's bad faith.

The Disputed Domain Name redirects to a webpage where the Disputed Domain Name is offered for sale for EUR 5,999. In view of this, and also as the Complainant reflected its NEUROCRINE trademark in multiple domain names shortly before the registration of the Disputed Domain Name, the Panel considers that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling it to the Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to

the Disputed Domain Name. However, UDRP panels have found that the practice as such of registering a domain name for subsequent resale (including for a profit) would not by itself support a claim that a respondent registered the domain name in bad faith with the primary purpose of selling it to a trademark owner or its competitor. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.1. Nevertheless, in the present case, the Respondent has not presented any justification for registering the Disputed Domain Name which is identical to the Complainant's NEUROCRINE trademark. The Panel is of the opinion that the Respondent was likely aware of the Complainant's distinctive trademark when registering the Disputed Domain Name. Moreover, the Respondent has been involved in several domain name proceedings in the past (as a respondent, including a recent similar case originating from the respondent's unauthorized registration of the domain name <neurocrine.si>), and the panels decided the transfer of all disputed domains names to the respective complainants.

Corroborating the aforementioned, the Panel considers that this supports an inference of bad faith registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name.

Thus, 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 <neurocrine.ro> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Monica Novac/  
Monica Novac  
Sole Panelist  
Date: November 12, 2025*