

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

AstraZeneca AB v. lun gui qu
Case No. D2025-1034

1. The Parties

The Complainant is AstraZeneca AB, Sweden, represented by Demys Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is lun gui qu, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lynparzabc.com> is registered with Domainplace LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 13, 2025. On March 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 18, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 March 20, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 9, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on April 10, 2025.

The Center appointed Colin T. O'Brien as the sole panelist in this matter on April 14, 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 global, science-led biopharmaceutical company headquartered in Cambridge, United Kingdom. The Complainant sells its olaparib drug (a poly ADP ribose polymerase (PARP) inhibitor) under the brand LYNPARZA. Lynparza is an oral, non-chemotherapy medication used to treat several types of cancer, including ovarian, breast, pancreatic and prostate cancer. Lynparza's use was first approved in December 2014 by the European Medicines Agency in the European Union, and by the Food and Drug Administration in the United States of America ("United States"). Since then, it has been widely approved to be used in breast cancer treatment – both in early and metastatic breast cancer settings. In 2023, the Complainant reported global product sales of USD 2,811 million. Lynparza is one of the leading medicines in the PARP inhibitor class globally across ovarian, breast, pancreatic. The Complainant operates a dedicated Lynparza website at "www.lynparza.com".

The Complainant holds an extensive global portfolio of registered trademarks for the term "Lynparza" including:

- Australia Reg. No. 1634554 LYNPARZA, registered on July 16, 2014, in Class 5;
- Chinese Reg. No. 14739744 LYNPARZA, registered on August 28, 2015, in Class 5;
- European Union Reg. No. 012506846 LYNPARZA, registered on August 30, 2015, in Class 5; and
- United States Reg. No. 4903563 LYNPARZA, registered on February 23, 2016, in Class 5.

The disputed domain name was created on November 14, 2024 (the "Disputed Domain Name"), and resolves to a website with adult content.

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 confusingly similar to its marks in that it only differs by the addition of the letters "bc" - presumably in this context a reference to the term "breast cancer", an area in which the Complainant's Lynparza drug is used for treatment. The added "bc" is closely related to its activities and does nothing to sufficiently distinguish the Disputed Domain Name from the Complainant's marks. Viewed as whole, the Complainant's mark is the most prominent, dominant, and distinctive element of the Disputed Domain Name.

The Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant has found no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known as Lynparza or Lynparza BC prior to or after the registration of the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant and has not received any permission or consent from the Complainant to use its LYNPARZA mark.

The Complainant has found no evidence that the Respondent owns any trademarks incorporating the term "Lynparza" or "Lynparza BC". Equally, the Complainant has found no evidence that the Respondent has ever traded legitimately under the name Lynparza or Lynparza BC. Given the fame of its mark and that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to said mark, there is no conceivable use to which the Disputed Domain Name could be put now, or in the future, that would confer any rights or legitimate interests upon the Respondent.

The Respondent specifically cannot claim a legitimate "fair use" interest as the nature of the Disputed Domain Name carries a risk of implied affiliation.

The Complainant notes that it previously owned the Disputed Domain Name until it lapsed in or around October 2024. The Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's marks, which predate the registration of the Disputed Domain Name by approximately 10 years. As such, it is more likely than not that the Respondent knew of, or should have known of, the Complainant and its LYNPARZA brand and mark when registering the Disputed Domain Name.

The Respondent has not made legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name. Instead, the Disputed Domain Name is being used to host pornographic content, aiming to commercially benefit by misleadingly diverting potential customers of the Complainant and boosting its own website traffic. This misuse of the Disputed Domain Name clearly infringes on the Complainant's rights and cannot confer any rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent. The Disputed Domain Name has been registered and 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

The Complainant has demonstrated it owns registered trademark rights in the LYNPARZA mark. The addition of other term "bc" does not prevent the Complainant's trademark from being recognizable in the Disputed Domain Name. The generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to a mark in which the Complainant has rights. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), sections 1.8 and 1.11.1, and *F. Hoffmann-La Roche AG v. Domain Admin, Privacy Protection Service INC d/b/a PrivacyProtect.org / Conan Corrigan*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-2316](#).

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant has presented a prima facie case that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name and has not been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. The fact that Respondent obtained the Disputed Domain Name years after Complainant had begun using its globally famous LYNPARZA mark indicates that Respondent sought to piggyback on the mark for illegitimate reasons.

After a complainant has made a prima facie case, the burden of production shifts to a respondent to present evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. See, e.g., *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0455](#).

The Respondent has provided no evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. Furthermore, the nature of the Disputed Domain Name, comprising Complainant's mark and with the abbreviation "bc" likely for Breast Cancer, indicates an awareness of Complainant and its marks and intent to take unfair advantage of such, which does not support a finding of any rights or legitimate interests

In the absence of any evidence rebutting the Complainant's prima facie case indicating the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Disputed Domain Name was registered years after the Complainant first registered and used its LYNPARZA mark and after the Complainant had started using the domain name <lynparza.com>. Considering the evidence on the record provided by the Complainant with respect to the extent of use of its globally famous LYNPARZA mark, the nature of the Disputed Domain Name which is nearly identical to the Complainant's primary domain name <lynparza.com> and differs from it by the additional of other term "bc" likely for "Breast Cancer" added to the Complainant's mark, combined with the absence of any evidence provided by the Respondent to the contrary, it is sufficient to satisfy the Panel that, at the time the Disputed Domain Name was registered, the Respondent undoubtedly knew of the Complainant's globally famous LYNPARZA mark, and knew that it had no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

There is prima facie no reason for the Respondent to have registered the Disputed Domain Name adding "bc" which likely stands for "breast cancer" to the Complainant's LYNPARZA mark. UDRP panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar (particularly domain names incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. See section 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

Further, by using the Disputed Domain Name for a website with adult content, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for possible commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 <lynparzabc.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Colin T. O'Brien/

Colin T. O'Brien

Sole Panelist

Date: April 28, 2025