

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Empower Clinic Services, L.L.C. d/b/a Empower Pharmacy v. kwry dafo
Case No. D2025-4516

1. The Parties

Complainant is Empower Clinic Services, L.L.C. d/b/a Empower Pharmacy, United States of America (U.S.), internally represented.

Respondent is kwry dafo, U.S.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <empowerpharmacyjobs.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 31, 2025. On November 3, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On November 6, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on November 10, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on November 11, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 20, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 10, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on December 11, 2025.

The Center appointed Kimberley Chen Nobles as the sole panelist in this matter on December 12, 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 compounding pharmacy and is known as Empower Pharmacy, having a website located at “www.empowerpharmacy.com”, a Twitter account “@EmpowerPharmacy” as well as numerous registered trademarks with for EMPOWER PHARMACY, for example:

- U.S. registered trademark number 5021918 for the EMPOWER PHARMACY word mark, registered on August 16, 2016;
- U.S. registered trademark number 5031072 for the EMPOWER PHARMACY combined word and figurative mark, registered on August 30, 2016; and
- U.S. registered trademark number 7504902 for the EMPOWER PHARMA word mark, registered on September 17, 2024.

Complainant’s main corporate website also has an entire page dedicated to careers and jobs, which includes job postings, hiring events, etc., located at “careers.empowerpharmacy.com” and Complainant also uses its marks on its careers page.

The Domain Name was registered on October 20, 2025, and at the time of filing of the Complaint, redirected to a parking page with pay-per-click (“PPC”) links related to the medical/pharmaceutical field. An email address associated with the Domain Name was also configured and used to facilitate the sending of job offer emails that passed off as belonging to or being affiliated with Complainant by using the EMPOWER PHARMACY marks in the email signature block and attaching fraudulent offer letters signed using the name of Complainant’s Chief Executive Officer.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

Notably, Complainant contends that (i) the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant’s trademarks; (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

In particular, Complainant contends that it has trademark registrations and rights for EMPOWER PHARMACY and that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name with the intention to confuse Internet users looking for bona fide and well-known EMPOWER PHARMACY products and services.

Complainant notes that it has no affiliation with Respondent, nor authorized Respondent to register or use a domain name, which includes Complainant’s trademarks, and that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the registration and use of the Domain Name. Rather, Complainant contends that Respondent has acted in bad faith in acquiring and setting up the Domain Name, when Respondent clearly knew of Complainant’s rights.

Accordingly, Complainant requests cancellation of the Domain Name.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the 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 Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)") states that failure to respond to the complainant's contentions would not by itself mean that the complainant is deemed to have prevailed; a respondent's default is not necessarily an admission that the complainant's claims are true.

Thus, although in this case Respondent has failed to respond to the Complaint, the burden remains with Complainant to establish the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy by a preponderance of the evidence.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Complainant has provided evidence of its rights in the EMPOWER PHARMACY trademarks, as noted above. Complainant has therefore proven that it has the requisite rights in the EMPOWER PHARMACY trademarks.

With Complainant's rights in the EMPOWER PHARMACY trademarks established, the remaining question under the first element of the Policy is whether the Domain Name, typically disregarding the Top-Level Domain ("TLD") in which it was registered (in this case, is ".com") is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks. See, e.g., *B & H Foto & Electronics Corp. v. Domains by Proxy, Inc. / Joseph Gross*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-0842](#).

Here, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant's EMPOWER PHARMACY trademarks. These EMPOWER PHARMACY trademarks are recognizable in the Domain Name.

The addition of the term "jobs" added after the EMPOWER PHARMACY trademark in the Domain Name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the EMPOWER PHARMACY trademarks. See section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

Thus, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied the first element of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, a complainant must make a prima facie showing that a respondent possesses no rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. See, e.g., *Malayan Banking Berhad v. Beauty, Success & Truth International*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-1393](#). Once a complainant makes such a prima facie showing, the burden of production shifts to the respondent, though the burden of proof always remains on the complainant. If the respondent fails to come forward with relevant evidence showing rights or legitimate interests, the complainant will have sustained its burden under the second element of the UDRP.

From the record in this case, it is evident that Respondent was, and is, aware of Complainant and its EMPOWER PHARMACY trademarks and does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Complainant has confirmed that Respondent is not affiliated with Complainant, or otherwise

authorized or licensed to use the EMPOWER PHARMACY trademarks or to seek registration of any domain name incorporating these trademarks. Respondent is also not known to be associated with the EMPOWER PHARMACY trademarks and there is no evidence showing that Respondent has been commonly known by the Domain Name.

In addition, Respondent has not used the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Rather, at the time of filing of the Complaint, Respondent used the Domain Name to offer employment opportunities through emails, essentially impersonating Complainant. UDRP panels have consistently held that use of a domain name for illegal activity — such as impersonation or passing off — can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1. Complainant further alleges that Respondent's use of its emails with the EMPOWER PHARMACY mark on the email signature block and fraudulent offer letter may also result in Respondent's collection of personal information from individuals seeking employment opportunities with Complainant.

Such use of the Domain Name is misleading and such potential attempts to reach individuals seeking employment with Complainant may result in giving the false impression to Internet users that the Domain Name is owned by Complainant. The resulting confusion would cause damage to Complainant's reputation, goodwill and interfere with Complainant's business activities. The use of a domain name for email phishing and impersonation/passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.

Accordingly, Complainant has provided evidence supporting its prima facie showing that Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Respondent has failed to produce countervailing evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Thus, the Panel concludes that Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name and Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that Respondent's actions indicate that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Names in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances indicating bad faith registration and use on the part of a respondent, namely:

“(i) circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) you have registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product or service on your website or location.”

The Panel finds that Complainant has provided ample evidence to show that registration and use of the EMPOWER PHARMACY trademarks long predate the registration of the Domain Name. Complainant is also well established and known. Indeed, the record shows that Complainant's EMPOWER PHARMACY

trademarks and related products and services are widely known and recognized. Therefore, and also noting the below use analysis, Respondent was clearly aware of the EMPOWER PHARMACY trademarks when it registered the Domain Name.

The Panel therefore finds that Respondent's awareness of Complainant's trademark rights at the time of registration suggests bad faith. See *Red Bull GmbH v. Credit du Léman SA, Jean-Denis Deletraz*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-2209](#); *Nintendo of America Inc v. Marco Beijen, Beijen Consulting, Pokemon Fan Clubs Org., and Pokemon Fans Unite*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-1070](#); and *BellSouth Intellectual Property Corporation v. Serena, Axel*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0007](#).

Moreover, the Domain Name's inclusion of Complainant's trademark in its entirety with an addition of the term "jobs" after the EMPOWER PHARMACY mark in the Domain Name, further reflects the awareness that Respondent had of Complainant and its trademarks at the time of registration. Such adoption of Complainant's trademarks at the time of registration of the Domain Name illustrates Respondent's effort to mislead Internet users as to the Domain Name's association with Complainant.

Moreover, Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name to confuse and mislead consumers looking for the bona fide and well-known EMPOWER PHARMACY products and services of Complainant, to its website likely for its own commercial benefit. In particular, at the time of filing of the Complaint, Respondent used the Domain Name in an attempt to direct Internet users looking for Complainant's products and services through the use of emails to communicate with individuals seeking employment with Complainant. In particular, Respondent's use of its emails with the EMPOWER PHARMACY mark on the email signature block and fraudulent offer letter may also result in Respondent's collection of personal information from individuals seeking employment opportunities with Complainant.

The resulting confusion from such impersonation and/or phishing communications would cause damage to Complainant's reputation and goodwill, and interfere with Complainant's business activities. The use of a domain name for email phishing and impersonation/passing off shows Respondent's acts of bad faith, and is not rebutted by Respondent.

UDRP panels have consistently held that Respondent's use of the Domain Name to trade off goodwill in Complainant's well-known trademark and impersonate Complainant constitutes bad faith. See *Philip Morris Products S.A. v. homn mohmoodi*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-4158](#). Moreover, such use of the Domain Name may potentially result in tarnishing Complainant's reputation and goodwill.

Further, the Panel also notes the failure of Respondent to submit a response.

In the present circumstances, considering the reputation of the EMPOWER PHARMACY trademarks and the fraudulent use of the Domain Name, the Panel finds that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

Therefore, the Panel finds that Complainant succeeds under the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 Domain Name <empowerpharmacyjobs.com> be cancelled.

/Kimberley Chen Nobles/

Kimberley Chen Nobles

Sole Panelist

Date: December 23, 2025