

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sanofi and Sanofi Biotechnology v. li jiang
Case No. D2025-2124

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Sanofi, France, and Sanofi Biotechnology, France, represented by Selarl Marchais & Associés, France.

The Respondent is li jiang, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <dupixnetmywayportal.com> is registered with Cosmotown, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 29, 2025. On May 30, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 31, 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 and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 3, 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 19, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 9, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 10, 2025.

The Center appointed Federica Togo as the sole panelist in this matter on July 21, 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

It results from the Complainants' undisputed allegations that the first Complainant is a French multinational pharmaceutical company headquartered in Paris (France) and settled in more than 100 countries on all five continents employing 100,000 people. It is one of the world's largest multinational pharmaceutical companies by prescription sales. It 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 Complainants have developed and sell throughout the world under the trademark DUPIXENT a drug indicated for the treatment of adult patients with inadequately controlled moderate-to-severe atopic dermatitis.

In particular, the second Complainant Sanofi Biotechnology - a subsidiary of the first Complainant – is the registered owner of many trademarks for DUPIXENT, e.g. European Union Trademark Registration No. 014683916, registered on January 28, 2016, for goods in class 5; and International Trademark Registration No. 1278059, registered on October 28, 2015 for goods in class 5.

In addition, the Complainants use the following domain names consisting of the mark DUPIXENT: <dupixent.com> registered on May 29, 2015 and <dupixent.ca> registered on July 21, 2016.

The disputed domain name <dupixnetmywayportal.com> was registered on January 15, 2025.

Furthermore, the undisputed evidence provided by the Complainants proves that the disputed domain name resolved to a parking page displaying pay-per-click ("PPC") links in the Complainants' area of activity.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a cancellation of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainants contend that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to their distinctive and well-known trademark DUPIXENT. In fact, the dominant part of the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to their prior trademarks, regardless of the purposeful misspelling of the mark DUPIXENT to read "DUPINET", which constitutes a clear case of typosquatting; the adjunction of the descriptive terms "mywayportal" suggesting a particular focus on a dedicated online platform for patients; the generic Top-Level Domain ".com".

The Complainants further contend that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. According to the Complainants, the Respondent did not even indicate his/her/its identity. In addition, the Complainants have never licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use their trademarks or to register any domain name including the above-mentioned trademarks. Indeed, the disputed domain name is leading to a parking website and has been registered only for the purpose unfairly attracting Complainants' consumers. It demonstrates that it was registered for the sole purpose of misleadingly diverting consumers into thinking that the Respondent is, in some way or another, connected to, sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainants and their business; or that the Respondent's activities are approved or endorsed by the Complainants.

Finally, the Complainants contend that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to the Complainants, given the distinctive nature of the mark DUPIXENT and the reputation of Sanofi's activities worldwide, the Respondent is likely to have had, at least, constructive, if not actual notice, as to the existence of Complainants' marks at the time he registered the domain name. This suggests that the Respondent acted with opportunistic bad faith in registering the domain name in order to make an illegitimate use of it. In addition, the disputed domain name has been registered for the purpose of attracting Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion – or at least an impression of association – between DUPIXENT trademarks and the disputed domain name. Finally, the disputed domain name is leading to a parking website and has been registered only for the purpose of unfairly attracting the Complainants' consumers, as it is clearly revealed on the Respondent's webpage. The advertisements and links proposed on the parking website provide without doubt income to the Respondent depending on the number of hits that are generated on the domain name, on a pay-per-click basis.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainants' contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to “decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable”. Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires a complainant to prove each of the following three elements in order to obtain an order that the disputed domain name be transferred or cancelled:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel will therefore proceed to analyze whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied.

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 Complainants' 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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.

In addition, it is the view of this Panel that the simply interspersing the vowel “e” and the consonant “n” in the term “dupixnet” in the disputed domain name results to be a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of the Complainants' trademark DUPIXENT, and cannot prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainants' trademark since the disputed domain name contains sufficiently recognizable aspects of the relevant mark (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) at section 1.9).

Although the addition of other terms here, “mywayportal”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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 Complainants have established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainants’ 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.

Furthermore, it results from the undisputed evidence before the Panel that the disputed domain name incorporating a typographical misspelling of the Complainants’ trademark resolves to a parking website comprising PPC links that compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the Complainants’ trademark or otherwise mislead Internet users (i.e., a parking page displaying PPC links in the Complainants’ area of activity). Prior UDRP panels have found that the use of a domain name to host a parked page comprising PPC links does not represent bona fide offering of goods or services, where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant’s mark or otherwise mislead Internet users (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) at section 2.9, with further references). This Panel shares this view. Therefore, such use can neither be considered as bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

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.

One of these circumstances is that the Respondent by using the disputed domain name, has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainants’ mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or location or of a product or service on its website or location (paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy).

In the present case, the Panel notes that it results from the Complainants’ documented allegations that the disputed domain name resolves to a parking page displaying PPC links in the Complainants’ area of activity.

For the Panel, it is therefore most likely that the Respondent knew the Complainants' mark which predates by many years the registration of the disputed domain name. Consequently, and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the Panel is convinced that the Respondent also knew that the disputed domain name included the Complainants' trademark when it registered the disputed domain name incorporating a typographical variation of such trademark.

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 this regard, the further circumstances surrounding the disputed domain name's registration and use confirm the Panel's findings that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith:

- (i) the nature of the disputed domain name (incorporating a typo the Complainants' trademark);
- (ii) the content of the website to which the disputed domain name directs (i.e., a parking page displaying PPC links in the Complainants' area of activity); and
- (iii) a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no response or explanation for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name.

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 <dupixnetmywayportal.com> be cancelled.

/Federica Togo/

Federica Togo

Sole Panelist

Date: August 4, 2025