

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Verfora SA v. Milen Radumilo

Case No. D2025-1949

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Verfora SA, Switzerland, represented by Troller Hitz Troller & Partner, Switzerland.

The Respondent is Milen Radumilo, Romania.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <perskindolhongkong.com> is registered with DropCatch.com LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 15, 2025. On May 15, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 16, 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 (Not disclosed owner) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 20, 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 May 27, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 28, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 17, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 18, 2025.

The Center appointed Catherine Slater as the sole panelist in this matter on June 23, 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 subsidiary of the Galenica group, an international pharmaceutical group.

The Complainant has used the PERSKINDOL trademark since 1981 for products for the treatment of pain and sports injuries.

The Complainant's trademark portfolio for the PERSKINDOL mark comprises hundreds of registrations around the world, including:

- International Trademark Registration No. 471878 for the word mark PERSKINDOL registered on September 24, 1982;
- International Trademark Registration No. 1592969 for the word mark PERSKINDOL registered on January 29, 2021.

The Complainant's parent company owns the domain name <perskindol.com> (registered on May 23, 1997). That domain name re-directs to <perskindol.ch> (registered on January 21, 1997).

The Respondent would appear to be an individual located in Romania who has been the Respondent in a large number of prior UDRP cases. In *American Airlines, Inc. v. Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot / Milen Radumilo*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1242](#) ("the American Airlines case"), the Panel noted that:

"There have been in excess of 80 decisions against him under the Policy. Examples include:

- *Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Limited v. Milen Radumilo*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-0658](#) (<tevaforhealth.com>);
- *Groupon, Inc. v. Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0155100866 / Milen Radumilo*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-3205](#) (<supportatgroupon.com>);
- *American Honda Motor Co., Inc. v. Perfect Privacy, LLC / Milen Radumilo*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-2417](#) (<acurausa.com>);
- *WhatsApp Inc. v. Milen Radumilo*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-1643](#) (<whatsappchatgroup.com>);
- *LEGO Juris A/S v. Milen Radumilo*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-0544](#) (<lego-racers.com>);
- *Facebook Inc., Instagram, LLC, WhatsApp Inc., Facebook Technologies, LLC v. Perfect Privacy, LLC / Milen Radumilo, Hush Whois Protection Ltd., Contact Privacy Inc., Host Master, Transure Enterprise Ltd*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-0510](#) (multiple domain names including <ahatsapp.com>);
- *International Business Machines v. Milen Radumilo*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-0328](#) (<01-ibm.com>);
- *Discover Financial Services v. Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0142035953 / Milen Radumilo*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-1449](#) (<samsclubdiscovercard.net>);
- *Compagnie Générale des Etablissements Michelin v. Milen Radumilo*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-2636](#) (<michelinroute.com>);
- *BASF SE v. Perfect Privacy LLC / Milen Radumilo*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1851](#) (<basf-it-services.net>);
- *Swatch AG v. Perfect Privacy, LLC / Milen Radumilo*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1370](#) (<wwwswatch.com>);
- *Accenture Global Services Limited v. Milen Radumilo*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1219](#) (<myidaccenture.com>)."

The disputed domain name was registered on September 29, 2023. There is no evidence that the disputed domain name has ever resolved to an active website. At the date of this decision, an attempt to visit the disputed domain name generated a number of pop-up messages to the effect that the website was illegal and had infected the computer with a virus.

On March 31, 2025 the Complainant sent a “cease-and-desist” letter to the Respondent. The Respondent did not reply.

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 PERSKINDOL trademark since it includes that trademark in its entirety and merely adds the geographical term “hongkong”.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name because the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to register/use the disputed domain name and/or the PERSKINDOL trademark. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, is not making a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name without intent for personal gain and has not used the disputed domain name in any manner (or at all) that might evidence any right or legitimate interest.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In particular, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith because the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its business activities and extensive use of its trademark (which would have been revealed by a simple internet search) and because PERSKINDOL is an invented term. The Complainant contends that the non-use of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith and there is no plausible good faith use to which it may be put. Finally, the Complainant contends that the Respondent’s failure to respond to the “cease-and-desist” letter and its involvement in more than 400 UDRP prior cases are both further evidence of bad faith. The Complainant contends that, in the circumstances, it is more likely than not that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name because of its confusing similarity to the PERSKINDOL trademark and because it knew of the Complainant’s global reputation.

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.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, “hongkong”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name 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 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

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 order to demonstrate that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith, the Complainant must show that the Respondent knew, or should have known, of its trademark. While the Complainant relies on the fact that its PERSKINDOL trademark is well known, its evidence (which would usually include e.g. business history, the geographical reach of the business, the number of offices and employees, turnover, marketing spend, media and industry recognition and any social media presence) is somewhat lacking in this regard. In any event, taking into account the evidence submitted and the Panel’s own review of the Complainant’s website, the Panel finds that the PERSKINDOL trademark is well-known. Given that finding and together with the fact that the disputed domain name reproduces the PERSKINDOL trademark identically (with the addition of a mere geographical term), that the trademark is itself distinctive (being an invented word) and that the Respondent has provided no explanation for its selection of the disputed domain name, the Panel infers that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the PERSKINDOL trademark in mind, and with the intention of profiting from, or otherwise exploiting, that trademark.

In view of the well-known and distinctive nature of the PERSKINDOL trademark and the identical reproduction of that trademark with only the addition of a geographical term, the Panel finds it difficult to conceive of any use that the Respondent could make of the disputed domain name without misrepresenting to Internet users that the disputed domain name is owned or operated by, or otherwise commercially affiliated with, the Complainant. The Panel therefore infers that the Respondent maintains the disputed domain name for the purpose of profiting from, or otherwise exploiting, the PERSKINDOL trademark.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes (i) the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, (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 implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put considering the composition of the disputed domain name and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Finally, and to paraphrase the American Airlines decision, the Panel finds that the previous activities of the Respondent provide an additional powerful indication of bad faith. The large number of prior UDRP cases decided against the Respondent show that he has cynically and systematically engaged in the business of registering domain names that incorporate the well-known trademarks of others for commercial advantage. The Panel is satisfied that this is merely another example of that modus operandi.

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 <perskindolhongkong.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Catherine Slater/

Catherine Slater

Sole Panelist

Date: July 4, 2025