

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

### **CHRISTUS HEALTH v. Jessica Nelson**

### **Case No. D2025-2805**

#### **1. The Parties**

Complainant is CHRISTUS HEALTH, United States (“United States”), represented by Dykema Gossett PLLC, United States.

Respondent is Jessica Nelson, United States.

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

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

#### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 16, 2025. On July 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 17, 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 Complainant on July 18, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on July 18, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 21, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 10, 2025. Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on July 24, 2025. Pursuant to Complainant’s request for suspension, the proceedings were suspended for purposes of settlement discussions on July 25, 2025 and reinstituted on September 19, 2025. Accordingly, the new Response due date was October 5, 2025. On October 6, 2025, the Center notified the parties of commencement of the panel appointment process.

The Center appointed Frederick M. Abbott as the sole panelist in this matter on October 9, 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**

Complainant is a non-profit corporation formed in the State of Texas, United States<sup>1</sup>. Complainant is a global health system made up of more than six hundred centers, including hospitals, clinics, and long-term care facilities across the United States, Mexico, and South America. CHRISTUS Health was formed as a Catholic not-for-profit health system in 1999 from two other Catholic health systems. CHRISTUS Health currently employs close to fifty thousand people, including over fifteen thousand physicians who provide individualized care.

Complainant operates its principal website at “www.christushealth.org”. Complainant directly or through its affiliated entities owns and uses various additional domain names employing the term CHRISTUS, most of which redirect to its principal website.

Complainant is the owner of registrations for the word, and word and design, trademark CHRISTUS on the Principal Register of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), including word trademark registration number 2517858, registration dated December 11, 2001, in international class (IC) 42, covering, inter alia, occupational medicine and rehabilitation consulting services, and; word and design trademark, registration number 2517892, registration dated December 11, 2001, in ICs 35 and 42, covering healthcare facilities management for others, and, inter alia, occupational medicine and rehabilitation consulting services. Complainant also is registrant of various CHRISTUS-formative trademarks, including word trademark CHRISTUS HEALTH, registration number 2517857, registration dated December 11, 2001, in IC 42, covering, inter alia, occupational medicine and rehabilitation consulting services.

According to the Registrar’s verification, Respondent is registrant of the disputed domain name. According to the WhoIs report, the disputed domain name was registered on May 10, 2025.

Respondent has used the disputed domain name to direct Internet users to a website having an appearance very substantially similar to Complainant’s principal website. Respondent’s virtual clone is headed with the term CHRISTUS Healthcare and uses a logo substantially similar to the logo employed by Complainant. Respondent’s website provides a portal for patients and prospective patients, labeled “MAKE AN APPOINTMENT”, that includes requesting contact details. Research undertaken by Complainant indicates that the physical address listed on Respondent’s website is located near one of Complainant’s hospitals, and that address is currently a construction site. In addition, Complainant has provided evidence in the form of an email to its employee from an individual who had responded to an email solicitation, originating from an address incorporating the second-level portion of the disputed domain name (adding the term “careers”), regarding potential employment, that she believed originated from Complainant. This individual stated that during an online interview she was asked to provide personal financial information, including credit card and banking information, which she found sufficiently unusual that she contacted Complainant.

There is no evidence on the record of these proceedings of any affiliation or association, commercial or otherwise, between Complainant and Respondent.

---

<sup>1</sup>Complainant did not specifically indicate its place of formation in its Complaint. A Panel search of the Texas tax-exempt entity database conducted pursuant to the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules shows a variety of entities using the name CHRISTUS, including CHRISTUS HEALTH, formed there. Panel visit of October 17, 2025, to: “www.comptroller.texas.gov/taxes/exempt/search.php”. Registrations at the USPTO submitted by Complainant in these proceedings refer to the trademark owner as CHRISTUS HEALTH non-profit corporation Texas, directly or by way of assignment.

## **5. Parties' Contentions**

### **A. Complainant**

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, Complainant contends that it owns rights in the trademarks CHRISTUS, CHRISTUS HEALTH, and other CHRISTUS-formative trademarks and that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to those trademarks.

Complainant alleges that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because: (1) Respondent is in no way affiliated with Complainant, and did not obtain a license from Complainant to use its trademarks; (2) Respondent is not commonly known by Complainant's trademark; (3) Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, instead it has used the disputed domain name in fraudulent activity intended to secure information from and otherwise take unfair advantage of Internet users.

Complainant argues that Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith because: (1) Respondent registered the disputed domain name to disrupt Complainant's business by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of Respondent's website that offers fake medical and hospital services; (2) Respondent has posted fake job listings, solicited interviews and otherwise attempted to gain access to personal information through use of a confusingly similar email address; (3) Respondent had knowledge of Complainant's well-known trademarks and reputation when it registered the disputed domain name.

Complainant requests the Panel to direct the Registrar to transfer the disputed domain name to Complainant.

### **B. Respondent**

Respondent did not file a Response in these proceedings. However, Respondent, on July 24, 2025, sent an email to the Center, including the following:

"I write on behalf of the registrant of the domain name christushealthcare.com, which is held in my Namecheap account. I confirm that I am a freelance developer who registered this domain on behalf of my client.

...

After reviewing the Complaint, I hereby consent to the transfer of the domain name christushealthcare.com to the Complainant. Please advise if you require any further information or formal documentation from me to effectuate the transfer."

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

The Panel notes that Jessica Nelson has indicated that the disputed domain name was registered on behalf of a client. The Panel also notes that little is known about the claimed client. There is no evidence on the existence of the relationship between Respondent and the alleged beneficial holder. In light of the above, the Panel considers it appropriate to find that the Registrar-confirmed registrant "Jessica Nelson" is the sole Respondent in these proceedings.

The Center formally notified the Complaint to Respondent at the email and physical addresses provided in its record of registration. Respondent provided an informal response by email to the Center. The Center took those steps prescribed by the Policy and the Rules to provide notice to Respondent.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy sets forth three elements that must be established by a complainant to merit a finding that a respondent has engaged in abusive domain name registration and use and to obtain relief.

These elements are that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which complainant has rights;
- (ii) 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.

#### **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 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.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of the trademarks CHRISTUS and CHRISTUS HEALTH for purposes of the Policy.<sup>2</sup> [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the marks are 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 "care", 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 Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on Complainant, panels have recognized that proving 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 Respondent. As such, where Complainant, as here, makes out a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on Complainant). If Respondent, as here, fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, Complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating

---

<sup>2</sup>The Panel uses the term "trademark" in its inclusive sense to cover both goods and services. For purposes of making its determination in these proceedings the Panel need not consider additional CHRISTUS-formative trademarks.

rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Respondent has created a virtual clone of Complainant's nonprofit business website, and it has solicited contact and other personal information from visitors to that website. In addition, although Complainant has not provided direct evidence that the email address used in attempting to secure personal financial information from a job interviewee is owned by Respondent, that email address fully incorporates the second-level portion of the disputed domain (adding the term "careers"). The Panel presumes, on the balance of probabilities, that the email forwarded to Complainant by the job interviewee originated from Respondent. Respondent did not attempt to rebut the relevant evidence and contention by Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate and illegal activity, here claimed as phishing and impersonation/passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on Respondent.

[WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that Respondent was manifestly aware of Complainant and its trademarks when it registered the disputed domain name as evidenced by Respondent's creation of a virtual clone of Complainant's principal website, including using a substantially similar logo.

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 held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate and illegal activity, here claimed as phishing and impersonation/passing off, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

In addition, Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks likely for commercial gain to create confusion as to Complainant acting as source, sponsor, affiliate or endorser of Respondent's deceptive website. This constitutes evidence of Respondent's bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that 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 <christushealthcare.com> be transferred to Complainant.

*/Frederick M. Abbott/*

**Frederick M. Abbott**

Sole Panelist

Date: October 23, 2025