

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Perrigo Pharma International DAC, Laboratoire HRA Pharma France SAS
v. userdc dger
Case No. D2025-3414

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Perrigo Pharma International DAC, Ireland and Laboratoire HRA Pharma SAS, France, represented by Omega Pharma Innovation & Development NV, Belgium.

The Respondent is userdc dger, United States of America (“US”).

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <compeedonline.shop> and <perrigosaleus.shop> are registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 25, 2025. On August 26, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On August 26, 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 (Redacted for Privacy Purposes, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on August 28, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint on August 28, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended 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 August 29, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 18, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 19, 2025.

The Center appointed Pablo A. Palazzi as the sole panelist in this matter on September 30, 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 Complainants are part of the Perrigo group of companies. The Complainants are hereinafter referred to as the Complainant. The Perrigo group is one of the largest over-the-counter self-care pharmaceutical enterprises conducting business on a global scale. The Perrigo group traces its historical origins to the year 1887, when Luther Perrigo, proprietor of a general mercantile establishment, conceived the commercial strategy of packaging and distributing patented medicinal preparations and household commodities for distribution through country store retail channels. Over the subsequent century and continuing to the present day, the Perrigo group has evolved into an international pharmaceutical conglomerate specializing in the development, manufacture, and commercialization of branded and private label self-care products, which are made available to consumers through retail establishments, pharmacy outlets, and electronic commerce platforms throughout the US, across the European continent, and in other significant commercial markets worldwide.

In the year 2021, the Perrigo group completed the acquisition of HRA Pharma group, a transaction which resulted in the incorporation of numerous intellectual property assets into the Perrigo group's brand portfolio, including specifically the trademark COMPEED.

The Complainant promotes its business at "www.compeed.com" and "www.perrigo.com".

The Complainant owns the following trademarks:

- US trademark PERRIGO (word mark) filed under No. 77752790 on June 5, 2009, and registered under No. 3823823 on 27 July 2010, in class 40 for "Contract manufacturing in the field of pharmaceuticals"; first use in commerce in January 1981;
- US trademark COMPEED filed under No. 85366521 on July 8, 2011, and registered under No. 4313800 on April 2, 2013, in class 5 for "blister care products, namely, adhesive pads and cushions", first use in commerce in October 2008.

The disputed domain names <perrigosaleus.shop> and <compeedonline.shop> were registered on July 18, 2025, and July 28, 2025, respectively.

At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name <perrigosaleus.shop> resolved to a website displaying the PERRIGO trademark to purportedly offer for sale both PERRIGO products and competing products. Most items used the PERRIGO in product descriptions including those originating from other companies. In addition, the bottom of the website displayed "copyright 2025 © Perrigo" and the page "About" mentioned "At Perrigo, we take pride [...]". Similarly, the disputed domain name <compeedonline.shop> resolved to a website using the COMPEED mark to promote and purportedly sell COMPEED products alongside competing and unrelated products. Most items used the COMPEED in product descriptions including those originating from other competitors. In addition, the bottom of the website displayed "copyright 2025 © Compeed" and the page "About" mentioned "At compeed, we take pride [...]".

The disputed domain names are currently inactive and not being used.

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 names.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 trademarks 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 each of the marks is recognizable within each of the disputed domain names respectively. Accordingly, each of the disputed domain names is confusingly similar to each of the marks respectively for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "online", "sale", and "us", 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 names and the marks 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 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 disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Further, the Panel finds that the composition of each of the disputed domain names, comprising each of the Complainant's two trademarks in their entirety respectively, with the addition of the terms "online" or "sale" and the country code "US", and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") "shop", carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

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:

- the Respondent registered around the same timeframe two disputed domain names including two trademarks of the Complainant.
- the Respondent registered the disputed domain names many years after the Complainant had used the trademarks in commerce.
- It is evident that the Respondent had the Complainant's trademarks in mind, as the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with two of the Complainant's marks within a short period of time and used them to purportedly offer the Complainant's products and competing products.

Considering the above, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites or other online locations, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's websites or locations or of a product or service on the Respondent's websites or locations. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

Although the disputed domain names are no longer in active use, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name 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 trademarks, and the composition of the two disputed domain names registered by the Respondent in a short frame period, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the current passive holding of the disputed domain names 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 <compeedonline.shop> be transferred to Laboratoire HRA Pharma SAS and the disputed domain name <perrigosaleus.shop> be transferred to Perrigo Pharma International DAC.

/Pablo A. Palazzi/

Pablo A. Palazzi

Sole Panelist

Date: October 18, 2025