

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Sanofi v. Sakib Tanoy  
Case No. D2025-2098

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is Sakib Tanoy, Bangladesh.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <sanofihealthcare.com> is registered with Name SRS AB (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 (Protected Protected, Shield Whois) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 4, 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 27, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 17, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 23, 2025.

The Center appointed José de Pierola as the sole panelist in this matter on July 25, 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-based global pharmaceutical corporation, with its headquarters located in France. It ranks as the fourth-largest pharmaceutical multinational worldwide in terms of prescription drug sales. The company operates in over 100 countries across five continents and has a workforce of more than 100,000 employees. Its core activities include the research, development, production, and marketing of pharmaceutical products, primarily within the prescription drug sector, although it also produces non-prescription (over-the-counter) medications.

The Complainant has submitted evidence that it is the owner of a large number of trademark registrations, including the following:

- SANOFI, French trademark with registration number 1482708, registered on August 11, 1988;
- SANOFI, International trademark with registration number 591490, registered on September 25, 1992;
- SANOFI, United Kingdom trademark with registration number UK00001483425, registered on January 15, 1993;
- SANOFI, European Union trademark with registration number 000596023, registered on February 1, 1999;
- SANOFI, United States of America trademark with registration number 85396658, registered on July 24, 2012.

The disputed domain name <sanofihealthcare.com> was registered on November 18, 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:

1. The disputed domain name was registered in bad faith, as:
  - The disputed domain name incorporates the SANOFI trademark, which is inherently distinctive.
  - It is clear that the Registrant lacks any legitimate interest in using the disputed domain name, as the Respondent's name, "Sakib Tanoy," bears no similarity to the term "SANOFI."
  - Considering the well-known and distinctive character of the "SANOFI" trademark, it is reasonable to conclude that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's rights at the time the disputed domain name was registered. This indicates that the Respondent likely registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, with the intent to exploit it for illegitimate purposes.
  - The inclusion of the generic and descriptive term "healthcare" is not enough to eliminate the likelihood of confusion and will simply lead Internet users to believe that the disputed domain name directs to a site offering the Complainant's health-related products.

2. The disputed domain name is being used in bad faith, as:
  - Considering the well-known and distinctive character of the SANOFI trademark, it is reasonable to conclude that the Respondent was at a minimum aware of the Complainant's rights at the time the disputed domain name was registered.
  - The disputed domain name resolves to an inactive website, and thus, the passive holding of such disputed domain name is evidence of the bad faith by the Respondent.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed, a complainant must establish each of the following elements:

- (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant holds rights;
- (ii) that the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in connection with the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that the domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

### **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 SANOFI 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, "healthcare", 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**

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.

The Panel observes that the Complainant has submitted proof of several SANOFI trademark registrations, all of which predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Panel further observes that the Complainant's trademark has been recognized as well known in several prior UDRP decisions referenced by the Complainant. Given this, and considering that the disputed domain name entirely incorporates the Complainant's trademark along with the descriptive term "healthcare"—a term directly related to the Complainant's industry—it is implausible that the Respondent chose the disputed domain name by mere coincidence and without awareness of the Complainant and its marks. Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Respondent either knew or ought to have known of the Complainant's trademark rights at the time of registration.

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.

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 or 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 <sanofihealthcare.com> be cancelled.

*/José de Pierola/*

**José de Pierola**

Sole Panelist

Date: August 8, 2025