

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Amgen Inc. v. Angelica Wright, Great Health Medicals
Case No. D2025-3479

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Amgen Inc., United States of America (“U.S.”), represented by Snell & Wilmer, L.L.P., U.S.

The Respondent is Angelica Wright, Great Health Medicals, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <amgens-inc.com> is registered with GMO Internet, Inc. d/b/a Discount-Domain.com and Onamae.com (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 27, 2025. On August 28, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 29, 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 amended Complaint on September 1, 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 September 2, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 22, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 24, 2025.

The Center appointed Francine Tan as the sole panelist in this matter on September 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 one of the global biopharmaceuticals leaders focused on research, innovation, and treatment in the areas of cardiovascular disease, oncology, bone health, neuroscience, nephrology, and inflammation. The Complainant operates in approximately 100 countries, including the U.S., the Netherlands (Kingdom of the), and Japan. It employs over 20,000 people worldwide. In 2024, it earned over USD 33 billion in worldwide revenue from its AMGEN-branded goods and services. The Complainant has invested millions of dollars in advertising and promoting its goods and services under the AMGEN mark throughout the world. As a result, the Complainant's AMGEN trade mark has acquired goodwill and recognition.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for AMGEN, including the following:

- U.S. trademark registration No. 1,621,967, registered on November 13, 1990;
- U.S. trademark registration No. 2,170,735, registered on July 7, 1998;
- U.S. trademark registration No. 3,226,919, registered on April 10, 2007;
- U.S. trademark registration No. 3,921,146, registered on February 15, 2011;
- U.S. trademark registration No. 3,180,419, registered on December 5, 2006; and
- European Union trademark No. 014683106, registered on April 7, 2016.

The Complainant owns and operates its primary domain name, <amgen.com>, which was registered on July 27, 1990.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 24, 2025, and at the time of filing the Complaint, did not resolve to any active website. The Complainant's evidence shows that the disputed domain name has apparently been used for sending emails to individuals, posing as the Complainant's Chief Executive Director of Global Supply Chain in the Netherlands (Kingdom of the), to negotiate the acquisition of pharmaceutical ingredients.

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:

- The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to its AMGEN trade mark in which it has rights. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's AMGEN trade mark in its entirety, along with the addition of the letter "s" after "amgen", and the suffix "-inc". These additions do not reduce the substantial identity between the Complainant's AMGEN mark and the disputed domain name. The addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" also does not reduce the substantial identity between the Complainant's trade mark and the disputed domain name.

- The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by Amgen, Amgens, or Amgens Inc. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to register or use the Complainant's AMGEN trade mark. There is no affiliation, connection, or association between the Respondent and the Complainant. The Complainant's AMGEN trade mark is an arbitrarily coined term, and therefore the disputed domain name is not one that the Respondent would legitimately choose unless it is seeking to create an impression of an association with the Complainant. There is no evidence that the Respondent has used or is preparing to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name did not resolve to a website. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to send emails posing as the Chief Executive Director of Global Supply Chain of the Complainant as part of a phishing scheme. This fraudulent use of the disputed domain name shows that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. This use is not a bona fide offering of goods or services, or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

- The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant has owned numerous worldwide trademark registrations for AMGEN, and numerous domain names containing "amgen" long before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. Given the Complainant's exclusive use of the AMGEN trade mark for decades, extensive sale of goods and services sold under the AMGEN mark, and the brand reputation associated with the AMGEN mark, it is not plausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's AMGEN trade mark at the time of registering the disputed domain name. The Respondent's bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name are evidenced by the Respondent's concealment of its identity and the sending of phishing emails using the disputed domain name.

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 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 mark is reproduced and 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.

Although the addition of other terms, here, the letter "s" and the suffix "-inc", 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 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 Respondent was not licensed or authorized by the Complainant to use the Complainant’s AMGEN mark or to register a domain name incorporating the trade mark. The disputed domain name does not resolve to any webpage, and there is no evidence that the Respondent is using or preparing to use it for any legitimate noncommercial or fair use, without intent for commercial gain.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity or different types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. In this case, there appears to be evidence of phishing and impersonation, which the Respondent has not rebutted. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Further, the fact that the Respondent did not file any response in this proceeding is indicative that it does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In any event, the Complainant’s AMGEN mark is well known and exclusively associated with the Complainant. Accordingly, it is not conceivable that the Respondent would be able to demonstrate that it has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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.

It is clear in this case that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and its AMGEN trade mark at the time it registered the disputed domain name and specifically targeted it. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel’s finding is based on these grounds. Although the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website, it has apparently been used for sending emails to individuals, posing as the Complainant’s Chief Executive Director of Global Supply Chain in the Netherlands (Kingdom of the), to negotiate the acquisition of pharmaceutical ingredients. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for purposes other than hosting a website may constitute bad faith. Such purposes include sending fraudulent emails, phishing, and identity theft. The Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name for the sending of phishing emails constitutes bad faith registration and use. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

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 <amgens-inc.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Francine Tan/

Francine Tan

Sole Panelist

Date: October 1, 2025