

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Hope Medical Enterprises, Inc. d/b/a Hope Pharmaceuticals v.  
Mounif Ghayth, Hopepharma Single Member P.C., Mahdi Gaith,  
Hope Pharma LB, Mahdi Gaith, Hopa Vita  
Case No. D2025-3748

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Hope Medical Enterprises, Inc. d/b/a Hope Pharmaceuticals, United States of America (“US” or “United States”), represented by Jones Day, United States.

The Respondent is Mounif Ghayth, Hopepharma Single Member P.C., Greece; Mahdi Gaith, Hope Pharma LB, Lebanon; Mahdi Gaith, Hopa Vita, United Arab Emirates.

### **2. The Domain Names and Registrars**

The disputed domain names <hopepharma.company> and <hopepharmalb.com> are registered with Tucows Domains Inc., and <hopepharma.online> is registered with Amazon Registrar, Inc. (the “Registrars”). The disputed domain names are together referred as the “Domain Names”.

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 16, 2025. On September 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Names. On September 16, 17 and 18, 2025, the Registrars transmitted by email respectively to the Center their verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Names which partially differed from the named Respondent (Hope Pharma Single Member P.C./Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0175130688/Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0175110048/On behalf of hopepharma.online owner, Identity Protection Service) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 19, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints for the Domain Names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all Domain Names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on September 24, 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 October 1, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 21, 2025. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on October 18, 2025, upon which the Center sent the possible settlement email to the Parties on October 20, 2025. As per the Complainant’s request, the Center notified the Parties of the suspension of the current proceedings on October 27, 2025, and the proceedings were suspended until January 25, 2026 due to the extension requests from the Complainant. Per the Complainant’s request, the proceedings were reinstated on January 28, 2026. Between October 18, 2025 and February 2, 2026, the Center received email communications from the Respondent.

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on February 2, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

#### **4. Factual Background**

The Complainant provides pharmaceutical, medicinal, and therapeutic products under its HOPE and HOPE PHARMACEUTICALS trademarks. Since at least 1993, the Complainant has invested substantial resources in promoting and protecting its trademarks.

The Complainant owns a global portfolio of trademarks incorporating the term “Hope”, such as International trademark registration No. 898,733 HOPE PHARMACEUTICALS registered on July 12, 2006; and US trademark registration No. 3,380,060 HOPE registered on February 12, 2008. The Complainant also owns the domain name <hopepharm.com> (registered in 1996) from which it operates its main Internet website.

The disputed domain name <hopepharma.company> was registered on May 30, 2025, <hopepharmalb.com> on June 2, 2025, whereas <hopepharma.online> was registered on January 31, 2022. The Complainant has documented that <hopepharma.company> has redirected to the website at <hopepharmalb.com>, and <hopepharma.online> at times has redirected to the website at a different domain name. The websites at the Domain Names appear to primarily sell vitamins and food supplements.

#### **5. Parties’ Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant argues that the Domain Names are under common control of the same person or entity. The Domain Names have resolved to websites with additional contact details suggesting the three Domain Names are under common control. This is backed by the fact that all three Domain Names have listed the email addresses ending with “@hopepharma.online” in their registration details. For two of the Domain Names most of the registration contact information is identical. Moreover, the Domain Names have all resolved to webpages that suggest common ownership.

The Complainant documents its trademark rights and argues that its trademarks are well known in the United States and globally. The Domain Names incorporate the entirety of the Complainant’s HOPE mark. The abbreviation of “pharmaceuticals” to “pharma” is wholly ineffective in reducing the confusingly similar nature of the marks and instead emphasizes the Complainant’s business. Similarly, the addition of the term “lb” to the end of one of the disputed domain name (<hopepharmalb.com>) does not prevent the finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Names. The Complainant has not licensed or authorized the Respondent to use its trademark. To the Complainant's knowledge, the Respondent has not been commonly known by the disputed domain names. The Respondent also registered the Domain Names through the privacy protection to hide its identity. Given this attempt to mask its identity through a proxy service, the Panel should presume that the Respondent is not commonly known by any of the Domain Names.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent's registration of the Domain Names, which are confusingly similar to the Complainant's widely-known trademark, creates a presumption of bad faith. The Respondent is intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's webpages.

The Complainant mentions that in May 2025, a confused customer of the Respondent alerted the Complainant to the existence of the website at the Domain Name <hopepharma.online>. On May 29, 2025, the Complainant sent trademark infringement reports to the website hosting provider and the e-commerce platform powering the online storefront, requesting the takedown of the website at <hopepharma.online>. The owner of the website responded on June 3, 2025, using the email address matching one of the Respondent's email addresses, that it acknowledged the Complainant's trademark rights and indicated necessary steps had been taken to address the matter and the relevant changes had been implemented. However, not only did the Respondent continue the sales of products on the website at the domain name <hopepharma.online>, it also registered <hopepharma.company> on May 30, 2025 and <hopepharmalb.com> on June 2, 2025 respectively.

The Respondent has also failed to respond directly to the Complainant's cease and desist letters. Failure to respond to such communications supports a finding of bad faith. Moreover, the Respondent's use of a privacy shield service to protect its identity further points to bad faith registration and use.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not submit a formal reply to the Complainant's contentions, but sent various email communications to the Center between October 18, 2025 and February 2, 2026. In particular, on October 18, 2025, the Respondent stated inter alia that:

"we, the Respondent, confirm our consent to transfer the mentioned domains to the Complainant in good faith and in the spirit of cooperation under Paragraph 17 of the UDRP Rules. We have fully ceased all use of these domains for any commercial purpose and have already disabled all redirections connected to them.

Our company, Hope Pharma Single Member P.C. (Greek registration ID 166637001000), was lawfully incorporated in Greece, where the name and domains were originally accepted and registered for nutraceutical business activity. However, as our operations expanded internationally, we recognize the importance of avoiding any potential confusion with existing trademarks in other jurisdictions. Upon receiving notice of the case, we immediately began thorough internal discussions to carefully assess our options and determine the most responsible way forward. [...] As a result, we decided to adopt a completely new and unrelated brand name, one that does not include the term 'Hope'."

The Respondent, on January 29, 2026, stated inter alia that:

"For the record, we have acted in good faith and have been actively engaged in settlement discussions with the Complainant. These efforts include the voluntary cessation of all 'Hope' branding, a legal company name change, domain transition planning, and the commencement of product relabeling. Any delays encountered were due to mandatory legal, banking, and regulatory processes outside of our direct control, rather than a lack of intent or cooperation."

The other email communications from the Respondent essentially summarized the actions it had taken to settle the dispute amicably including the company's legal name change from Hope Pharma to Globa Vitae, the update of its social media accounts, and relabeling of its products.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **6.1. Procedural Matters - Consolidation of Domain Name Registrants**

The Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant argues that the domain name registrants are the same entity or under common control. The Complainant requests consolidation of the disputes against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules. Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder. In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.11.2.

As regards the common control, the Panel notes that the three Domain Names have listed the email addresses all ending with "@hopepharma.online" in their registration details. The Domain Name <hopepharma.company> has redirected to the website at the Domain Name <hopepharmalb.com>, and the Domain Names have all resolved to webpages that suggest common ownership. Moreover, the abovementioned email communication in which the Respondent consented to transfer the Domain Names, suggests that the Domain Names are under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party. The different domain name registrants have been given the possibility, but they did not object to the Complainant's consolidation request.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

### **6.2. Substantive Issues**

#### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

The test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain names. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. The Complainant has established trademark rights in HOPE and HOPE PHARMACEUTICALS.

The Domain Names incorporate the Complainant's trademark HOPE with the addition of the term "pharma" or "pharmalb". The additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Names and the trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8. For the purpose of assessing the confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel may ignore the Top-Level Domains. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.

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. See [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 showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. The Respondent is not affiliated with or related to the Complainant. There is no evidence that the Respondent has registered the Domain Names as a trademark or acquired trademark rights relevant to the Domain Names. There is no evidence of the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Names or names corresponding to the Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Although the Respondent claimed company name includes "Hope Pharma", there is no evidence showing that the Respondent has been commonly known by the Domain Names. Moreover, the Respondent also claims that it has changed the company name to Globa Vitae.

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 incorporation of the Complainant's trademark in the Domain Names, and the use of the Domain Names for websites primarily selling vitamins and food supplements, proves that the Respondent was most likely aware of the Complainant and its prior rights when the Respondent registered the Domain Names. This is further supported by the fact that the Respondent reacted to the Complainant's request to takedown the website at "www.hopepharma.online" by registering the other two Domain Names. Considering the circumstances of this case, the Panel concludes that the registration and use of the Domain Names has been done in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark.

For the reasons set out above, the Panel concludes that the Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. 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 the Domain Names <hopepharma.company>, <hopepharmalb.com>, and <hopepharma.online> transferred to the Complainant.

*/Mathias Lilleengen/*

**Mathias Lilleengen**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 10, 2026