

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sanofi v. Sakib Tanoy
Case No. D2025-2095

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Sanofi, France, represented by Marchais & Associés, France.

The Respondent is Sakib Tanoy, Bangladesh.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sanofiinternational.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 27, 2025. On May 28, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 29, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 2, 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 amendment to the Complaint on June 10, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 June 11, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 29, 2025. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on June 11, June 12, June 29, and July 24, 2025. According to the correspondence, the matter was suspended and deadline was extended until July 30, 2025. However, the Complainant requested on July 24, 2025, that the proceedings be reinstated.

The Center appointed Elizabeth Ann Morgan as the sole panelist in this matter on August 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 is a multinational pharmaceutical company headquartered in Paris, with consolidated net sales of EUR 43 billion in 2022, EUR 37,7 billion in 2021, EUR 36.04 billion in 2020, EUR 34.46 billion in 2018, EUR 35.05 billion in 2017, EUR 33.82 billion in 2016, EUR 34.06 billion in 2015 and EUR 31.38 billion in 2014. The Complainant ranks as one of the largest multinational pharmaceutical company in the world by prescription sales. The Complainant engages in research and development, manufacturing and marketing of pharmaceutical products for sale, principally in the prescription market, but the firm also develops over-the-counter medication. The Complainant is a full member of the European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industries and Associations (EFPIA).

Historically, the Complainant was formed as Sanofi-Aventis in 2004 by the merger of Aventis and Sanofi-Synthélabo and changed its name to Sanofi in May 2011. The Complainant is a multinational company based in more than 100 countries on all 5 continents employing 100,000 people. The Complainant offers a wide range of patented prescription drugs to treat patients with serious diseases and has leading positions in 7 major therapeutic areas, namely cardiovascular, thrombosis, metabolic disorders, oncology, central nervous system, internal medicine, and vaccines.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademarks around the world including but not limited to: French trademark SANOFI number 1482708, registered on August 11, 1988, in classes 1, 3, 4, 5, 10, 16, 25, 28, and 31 notably concerning pharmaceutical products; European Union Trade Mark SANOFI number 010167351, filed on August 2, 2011, and registered on January 7, 2012, in classes 3, and 5 notably concerning pharmaceutical products; and European Union Trade Mark SANOFI number 004182325, filed on December 8, 2004, and registered on February 9, 2006 in classes 1, 9, 10, 16, 38, 41, 42, and 44 notably concerning products in pharmaceutical and medical spheres.

The Complainant also is the owner of numerous domain names including but not limited to: <sanofi.com> registered on October 13, 1995; <sanofi.eu> registered on March 12, 2006; and <sanofi.fr> registered on October 10, 2006.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 14, 2024. The disputed domain name resolves to a Registrar parking page.

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 contested domain wholly incorporates its distinctive trademark in its entirety and is confusingly similar to that mark despite the addition of a descriptive term.

The Respondent does not have any legitimate interest regarding the disputed domain name. The Complainant has never licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use its trademark or to register any domain name including the above-mentioned trademark. The Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name nor is he using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, so as to confer a right or legitimate interest in it as the disputed domain name simply resolves to an inactive webpage.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the composition of the disputed domain name consisting of the entirety of the Complainant's trademark and a descriptive term, coupled with its use to resolve to a Registrar parking page, are indicative of bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not substantively reply to the Complainant's contentions. However, on June 11, 2025, the Respondent claimed to not be the beneficial owner of the disputed domain name but rather to have purchased and registered the disputed domain name on behalf of a third-party client as part of his web services work. After the commencement of the proceedings on the same day, the Respondent sent a further email communication expressing interest in potentially discussing the sale of the disputed domain name to the Complainant in an attempt to resolve this matter amicably.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Respondent Identity

Paragraph 1 of the UDRP Rules defines the respondent as "the holder of a domain name registration against which a complaint is initiated". The Registrar confirmed the registrant of the disputed domain name is "Sakib Tanoy"; however, the Respondent claims it registered the disputed domain name on behalf of a third-party client as part of his web services work. The Respondent provided a screen capture of an individual's name and phone number, as well as a communication from November 8, 2024, merely listing the disputed domain name along with two other domain names. No evidence of a relationship or work request was provided, and the third party submitted no communications to the Center.

Noting the definition of a respondent in the Rules, and the confirmation of the Registrar, the Panel finds that the Respondent is "Sakib Tanoy" for the purposes of the Policy. Moreover, the Panel notes that any potential relationship of the third party to the registration of the disputed domain name does not alter the Panel's findings below.

B. 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, "international", may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent the 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.

C. 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.

D. 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.

The Panel notes the Complainant’s widespread global operations, as well as the longstanding registration of its trademark, which is a coined term. In these circumstances inter alia, the Panel considers it most likely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant’s trademark in mind, which supports a finding of bad faith in this case.

Moreover, 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. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, and 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.

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 <sanofiinternational.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Elizabeth Ann Morgan/
Elizabeth Ann Morgan
Sole Panelist
Date: August 11, 2025