

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Nobel Biocare Services AG v. george may, Noble May & Associates Pty Ltd
Case No. D2025-2487

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Nobel Biocare Services AG, Switzerland, represented by Zacco Sweden AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is george may, Noble May & Associates Pty Ltd, Australia.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <allon4australia.com>, <allon4brisbane.com>, <allon4dentistbalwynkew.com>, <allon4dentistmelbourne.com>, <allon4dentistssydney.com>, <allon4goldcoast.com>, <allon4implantsnearme.com>, <allon4newfarm.com>, <allon4sydney.com>, <brisbaneallon4.com>, <dentistallon4.com>, <dentistsallon4.com>, <melbourneallon4.com>, <newfarmallon4.com>, <southportallon4implantdentist.com>, <sydneyallon4dentists.com> and <sydneyallon4implants.com> are registered with Key-Systems GmbH (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 24, 2025. On June 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 5, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 9, 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 July 9, 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”). The Center requested a modification in the Amendment Complaint and the Complainant filed the Amendment Complaint on July 10, 2025.

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 11, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 31, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 5, 2025. On July 16 and July 23, 2025, the Center received communications from a third party.

The Center appointed Karen Fong as the sole panelist in this matter on August 12, 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 Swiss company group founded in 1981. It is part of Envista Holdings Corporation which operates more than 30 brands in the dental sector. The annual revenue of the group is USD 2.3 billion. The Complainant specializes in the field of dental implantology. One of its implant treatments is called ALL-ON-4. The Complainant claims that the treatment ALL-ON-4 was first introduced by the Complainant. The ALL-ON-4 trade mark is registered in many jurisdictions including Australia, the European Union and China. These registrations include the following:

- International Trade Mark Registration No. 1036397 (designating inter alia, Australia) for ALL-ON-4 registered on February 23, 2010; and
- International Trade Mark Registration No. 1418882 (designating inter alia, Australia) for ALL-ON-4 registered on June 26, 2018.

(individually and collectively, referred to as the "Trade Mark").

The Respondent who is based in Australia appears to run a dental marketing and lead-generation business for dentists seeking patient leads across Australia associated with the website at <australiandentists.com.au> (the "Respondent's Site"). He and/or his business owns and operates a large network of dental websites and domain names which include the Trade Mark. It appears that these sites are designed to rank on Google and capture patient enquiries, which are then passed on to his dentist clients. He presents his service as a results-driven alternative to traditional advertising, claiming to deliver thousands of patient leads to these clients. The Respondent is also a shareholder of the Australian company NMBS with Australian Company Number 605369042.

The following are the details of the 17 disputed domain names (the "Domain Names") filed in these proceedings and the websites (the "Websites") to which they are connected to:

No.	Domain Names	Date of Registration	Websites
1	<allon4australia.com>	May 15, 2024	Holding page saying "coming soon for a local dental practice" – "AustralianDentists.com.au" Since 2008: Online Dental Marketing That Guarantees Results – Or It's Free"
2	<allon4brisbane.com>	February 7, 2023	Identical to Website 1
3	<allon4dentistbalwynkew.com>	February 22, 2025	Website for a dental practice offering dental products and services
4	<allon4dentistmelbourne.com>	December 16, 2023	Redirects to "www.dentalboutique.com.au" – an Australian dental website
5	<allon4dentistssydney.com>	February 21, 2025	Identical to Website 1
6	<allon4goldcoast.com>	March 20, 2025	Identical to Website 1

No.	Domain Names	Date of Registration	Websites
7	<allon4implantsnearme.com>	February 21, 2025	Identical to Website 1
8	<allon4newfarm.com>	September 13, 2016	Resolves to the Littleton Cole Dental Centre
9	<allon4sydney.com>	March 12, 2025	Identical to Website 1
10	<brisbaneallon4.com>	May 15, 2024	Identical to Website 1
11	<dentistallon4.com>	December 27, 2019	Identical to Website 1
12	<dentistsallon4.com>	December 27, 2019	Identical to Website 1
13	<melbourneallon4.com>	December 16, 2023	Identical to Website 4
14	<newfarmallon4.com>	June 6, 2024.	Identical to Website 1
15	<southportallon4implantdentist.com>	December 16, 2023	Resolves to a website with the heading "Main Beach Dental on the Gold Coast" as well as the same template page on Website 3 except it is partially filled with details and refers to Southport Dental Practice with a contact address at the domain name <australiandentists.com.au>
16	<sydneyallon4dentists.com>	March 20, 2025	Identical to Website 1
17	<sydneyallon4implants.com>	March 20, 2025	Identical to Website 1

On October 17, 2024, the Complainant's Australian legal representatives sent a cease and desist letter by registered mail to the director of NMBS in relation to numerous domain names comprising the Trade Mark including the Domain Names. A copy of an undated response from "George" which is alleged to be from NMBS has been submitted in evidence. In that response, the writer explains that until recently he was unaware that ALL-ON-4 is a registered trademark of the Complainant and assumed it was a generic dental term. He has since instructed his team to pause any new activity using the term. He claimed that he has made significant investment over 15 years in building a network of dental websites that generate enquiries for long-standing dentist clients, and stresses that his aim is to create a "win-win" outcome for the Complainant, his business, and those dentists. While acknowledging the trade mark issue, he argues that his service drives substantial patient demand for the ALL-ON-4 procedures in Australia and positions his business as a potential asset rather than a threat to the Complainant.

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 Domain Names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the Domain Names are identical and/or confusingly similar to the Trade Mark in which it has rights, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the Domain Names, and that the Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Complainant requests transfer of the Domain Names.

B. Respondent

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

A third party, director of NMBS, did file a submission, although from an email address that was not among those to which the Center had sent notice of the proceedings. The director stated that NMBS is one of the named Respondents, but that the company has had no knowledge of, involvement in, or benefit from the registration or use of the Domain Names. According to the director, the Domain Names were registered by

George May, a shareholder of NMBS who has never been a director, employee, or authorised agent of the company. The director further asserted that Mr May had no authority to register the Domain Names or act on behalf of NMBS in any capacity. He therefore requested that NMBS be removed as a Respondent in these proceedings.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Issue

The Panel notes that the Respondent in this proceeding is George May of Noble May & Associates Pty Ltd (“NM&A”), as verified by the Registrar. The Complaint was initially filed against NMBS, although the Complainant has not set out the basis upon which it believed NMBS to be the registrant. Following Registrar verification, the Complaint was amended to identify the present Respondent. While both NM&A and NMBS share the words “Noble May” in their names, no evidence has been adduced to establish that they are the same entity. The Panel therefore confirms that NMBS is not a party to these proceedings and will proceed solely against George May of NM&A as the Respondent.

6.2 Substantive Issues

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the entirety of the Trade Mark is reproduced within all the Domain Names. Accordingly, the Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of the geographical and descriptive terms here including “australia”, “brisbane”, “dentist”, “dentists”, “balwynkew”, “melbourne”, “sydney”, “goldcoast” “implants”, “near”, “me”, “new”, “farm” and “southport” before and after the Trade Mark in the Domain Names 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 Domain Names and the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Based on the available record, 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.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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 record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. 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 Domain Names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

As discussed in detail below, the Panel finds that the Respondent can reasonably be assumed to have known of the Complainant and its trademark when registering the disputed domain names, particularly given that the Respondent effectively operates in the same field as the Complainant. The Panel notes that the Respondent's claimed ignorance does not absolve him from responsibility. In the circumstances, the composition and the use of the disputed domain names create a risk of confusion, which cannot confer rights or legitimate interests.

Based on the available record, 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 Respondent in its response to the Complainant's cease and desist letter claims that he never heard of the Complainant, did not know the Complainant had a trademark for ALL-ON-4, and that he thought it was a generic dental term like "Root Canal Therapy". However, the Panel notes the reputation of the Trade Mark, the Respondent's professed marketing expertise in the field of dentistry, and the fact that Trade Mark was registered in Australia where the Respondent is based prior to the registration of the Domain Names. Moreover, to the extent he claims the mark is generic, the fora to advance that is with the relevant trademark authority. The Panel furthermore notes that the Respondent registered some of the disputed domain names after receipt of the Complainant's cease and desist letter. It is therefore implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant when he registered those Domain Names.

In the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2 states as follows:

"Noting the near instantaneous and global reach of the Internet and search engines, and particularly in circumstances where the complainant's mark is widely known (including in its sector) or highly specific and a respondent cannot credibly claim to have been unaware of the mark (particularly in the case of domainers), panels have been prepared to infer that the respondent knew, or have found that the respondent should have known, that its registration would be identical or confusingly similar to a complainant's mark. Further factors including the nature of the domain name, the chosen top-level domain, any use of the domain name, or any respondent pattern, may obviate a respondent's claim not to have been aware of the complainant's mark."

The fact that there is a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with the Respondent's choice of the seventeen Domain Names without any official explanation is also a significant factor to consider (as stated in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1). The Domain Names fall into the category stated above and the Panel finds that the registration is in bad faith.

The Panel finds that the Respondent's use of the Domain Names is also in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b) of the Policy. The evidence shows that the Domain Names resolve to three distinct types of websites:

- "Coming soon" pages which display a link to the Respondent's Site thereby directing Internet users to the Respondent's lead-generation platform.

- Template websites for dental practices, in some cases partially populated with practice details but ultimately tied back to the Respondent's marketing platform and the Respondent's Site.
- Websites of third-party dental practices, demonstrating that the Respondent has actively redirected traffic generated by the Domain Names to commercial operators unconnected with the Complainant.

By incorporating the Complainant's distinctive Trade Mark in each of the Domain Names and deploying them across these various categories of sites, the Respondent has intentionally created a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark for commercial gain. As noted in section 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), such conduct constitutes use in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Further, the Respondent has registered and used seventeen separate Domain Names, each incorporating the Complainant's Trade Mark together with geographic or descriptive terms. This pattern of opportunistic targeting conduct is consistent with paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy and, as noted in section 3.1.2 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), supports a finding of bad faith where multiple registrations prevent a complainant from reflecting its mark in domain names. The scale and systematic nature of the Respondent's registrations underscore a deliberate strategy to target and exploit the Complainant's Trade Mark across multiple locations in Australia.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has used the Domain Names in bad faith within the meaning of paragraphs 4(b)(ii) and 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Based on the available record, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <allon4australia.com>, <allon4brisbane.com>, <allon4dentistbalwynkew.com>, <allon4dentistmelbourne.com>, <allon4dentistssydney.com>, <allon4goldcoast.com>, <allon4implantsnearme.com>, <allon4newfarm.com>, <allon4sydney.com>, <brisbaneallon4.com>, <dentistallon4.com>, <dentistsallon4.com>, <melbourneallon4.com>, <newfarmallon4.com>, <southportallon4implantdentist.com>, <sydneyallon4dentists.com>, and <sydneyallon4implants.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Karen Fong/

Karen Fong

Sole Panelist

Date: August 27, 2025