

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SANO VITA S.R.L. v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2025-4353

1. The Parties

The Complainant is SANO VITA S.R.L., Romania, represented by Cosmovici Intellectual Property SaRL, Switzerland.

The Respondent is Name Redacted¹.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sanovita.shop> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 23, 2025. On October 23, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 24, 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 (redacted for privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 24, 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 October 29, 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”).

¹The Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent’s name from this decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST 12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on October 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 19, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on November 24, 2025. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on November 24, 2025.

The Center appointed John Swinson as the sole panelist in this matter on November 26, 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.

After reviewing the case file, and noting the content of the Respondent's email communication dated November 24, 2025, the Panel issued Procedural Order No.1 on December 18, 2025, requesting the Center to also forward a copy of the Notification of Complaint and Commencement of Administrative Proceeding, dated October 30, 2025, to an email address sanovitaromenia@[xxx] listed under the Respondent's website Privacy Policy, and allowing the Respondent to provide any comment to the Complaint by December 25, 2025. There was no email communication received from the Registrar's confirmed email address of the Respondent nor from the email address listed under the Respondent's website Privacy Policy by the specified due date.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a Romanian food production and distribution company that was founded in 1995. The Complainant specializes in the manufacturing and marketing of natural, vegetarian, and plant-based foods. The Complainant's production facilities located in Vâlcea County, Romania.

The Complainant owns a portfolio of European and Romanian trademark registrations, including European Union Registration No. 008904501 for SANOVITA with a green logo that appears to represent two green hillsides. This registration was registered on May 3, 2011.

The Complainant's website is located at the domain name <sanovita.ro>.

The Respondent did not file a formal Response, so little information is known about the Respondent. According to Registrar records, the Respondent has an address in Brazil.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 11, 2025.

The website at the disputed domain name is branded SANOVITA and advertises medical devices such as an electronic blood pressure monitor and Siemens/Omron branded blood glucose level monitors. The website is in various languages, such as Romanian, Dutch and Portuguese. The contact address in the privacy policy is an address in Brazil. The website appears to use the Shopify online commerce system to accept orders.

The Center received an email from a person in Brazil using the same email address as the email address of the Respondent (as set out in the Registrar's records). This person indicates that it is a Brazilian and work with companies in Brazil in video production and social media management, it does not understand the Center's Notification of Respondent Default email, and is asking if this is a scam. The email message suggests that the named Respondent might not create the website at the disputed domain name.

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.

In summary, the Complainant makes the following submissions:

The disputed domain name includes the Complainant's SANOVITA in its entirety.

The term "SanoVita" is not a descriptive word or belonging to the basic vocabulary. It has been created by the Complainant with a view of reflecting the fact that the business is driven by a clear mission to promote natural care for individuals, family, and the planet, positioning itself as a leader committed to well-being and a natural, healthy lifestyle. Therefore, the term "SanoVita" is not a word that a trader would rightly choose, unless seeking to create an impression to associate with the Complainant.

The public would associate SanoVita, whether it is used for services or on the Internet, to the Complainant's business activity and long history of providing excellent healthy foods and plant-based products.

A website at the disputed domain name would confuse the public, who would think that the website is an official website for the Complainant.

On the website at the disputed domain name, the Respondent offers for sale what appear to be questionable medical devices (blood pressure monitor, blood glucose levels monitor, intelligent medical watch), presented in a peculiar mix of the Romanian language and Portuguese language. Moreover, the contact page appears to be exclusively Dutch language, with no option to choose a different language, while also mentioning "At Tulipscents, your satisfaction is our top priority" in Dutch, indicating that the text was probably copied from the website of a company called Tulipscents.

B. Respondent

Apart from the email communication received by the Center on November 24, 2025 as mentioned above, the Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, namely:

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

The onus of proving these elements is on the Complainant.

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 within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 disputed domain name includes "SanoVita" which is Latin for "healthy life". The website purportedly sells medical devices. Accordingly, there is a potential reason why the Respondent selected the disputed domain name for a website for medical devices. However, the Respondent did not respond to inform the Panel if that is in fact the case even though Procedural Order No. 1 was also issued. It is also unclear why the website at the disputed domain name is in three different languages, including Romanian which is language used on the Complainant's website. It is not usual for a Brazilian website to include text in Romanian.

The evidence provided by the Complainant also shows that the contact us page displayed "At Tulipscents, your satisfaction is our top priority" in Dutch. Therefore, the website at the disputed domain name appears to the Panel to be a website that was created by copying text from other websites. It does not appear to be a genuine e-commerce website, but a website hastily created for some unknown purpose. The Complaint alleges that the website is not bona fide. The Respondent had the opportunity to come forward with evidence that the website at the disputed domain name is legitimate but did not take the opportunity to do so.

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.

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.

As discussed above in relation to the second element of the Policy, the website at the disputed domain name appears not to be a legitimate website. It is probable that the website was created for some improper purpose. The Panel also notes that the Respondent appears to have registered the disputed domain name using the name and address of a third party. In addition, there is an email address [sanovitaromenia@\[xxx\]](mailto:sanovitaromenia@[xxx]) listed under the Respondent's website Privacy Policy. The term chosen in the email address "sanovitaromenia" ("sanovita" and "romenia" – Romania in Portuguese) appears to show the knowledge of the Complainant's trademark and its location. Although the Panel issued Procedural Order No.1 requesting the Center to also forward a copy of the Notification of Complaint and Commencement of Administrative Proceeding to the email address [sanovitaromenia@\[xxx\]](mailto:sanovitaromenia@[xxx]) and allowing the Respondent a period of seven days to comment on the Complaint, there was no communication was received from the Respondent by the due date. In the absence of any explanation from the Respondent regarding its choice of "sanovita" in the disputed domain name and the apparent nature of the website at the disputed domain name being sham, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name.

Based on the use of the website as mentioned under section 6.B, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. 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 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 <sanovita.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/John Swinson/

John Swinson

Sole Panelist

Date: December 10, 2025