

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LABORATOIRE HRA PHARMA SAS v. Domain Privacy, Domain Name Privacy Inc
Case No. D2025-4544

1. The Parties

The Complainant is LABORATOIRE HRA PHARMA SAS, France, represented by Omega Pharma Innovation & Development NV, Belgium.

The Respondent is Domain Privacy, Domain Name Privacy Inc, Cyprus.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mederma.online> is registered with Communigal Communications Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 4, 2025. On November 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 9, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 10, 2025, providing the additional registrant information disclosed by the Registrar.

The Center verified that the 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 November 12, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 2, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties of the Respondent’s default on December 8, 2025.

The Center appointed Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa 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

The Complainant, a subsidiary of global pharmaceutical group Perrigo, is a French company that markets skin care products, in particular for scars and stretch marks. It is the proprietor of several registrations for its MEDERMA mark, including United States Trademark Registration No. 3233153 for MEDERMA (word mark), registered on April 24, 2007 for goods in class 5, claiming a date of first use in 1997.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 27, 2025. At the time of the Complaint and of this decision, it resolved to a website displaying pay-per-click (PPC) links related to skincare treatments.

The record contains evidence that the disputed domain name is available for sale for USD 588.

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 to its MEDERMA trademark, The Respondent has no link with the Complainant, which has not authorized the Respondent to register the contested domain name. The contested domain name points to a parking page with links related to skin care products, which is the field of the Complainant's MEDERMA products. Moreover, the disputed domain name is for sale for USD 588, which is more than out-of-pocket expenses.

The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the UDRP requires the Complainant to make out all three of the following:

- (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 Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Under paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, "[a] Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable".

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 Panel notes the composition of the disputed domain name, which consists of the Complainant’s MEDERMA mark. Therefore, the Panel finds that the nature of the disputed domain name carries a high risk of implied affiliation to the Complainant that cannot constitute fair use. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor that there are any circumstances or activities that would establish the Respondent’s rights therein. Rather, the disputed domain name resolves to a website featuring PPC links related to the Complainant’s business. Under these circumstances, such use does not represent a bona fide offering of goods or services. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9.

The Panel notes that offering the disputed domain name for sale is not a use that would support a finding of rights or legitimate interests. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.2.

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.

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name primarily to sell the disputed domain name for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent’s costs related to the disputed domain name (absent any evidence from the Respondent to the contrary). See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 3.1.1.

In particular, the Panel notes that the Complainant's rights in its MEDERMA mark predate the registration of the disputed domain name by more than a decade. The disputed domain name reflects the Complainant's mark in its entirety. The sum of USD 588 appears to be in excess of the costs related to registering the disputed domain name (absent any evidence from the Respondent to the contrary).

The Panel finds that the use of the disputed domain name to resolve to a website featuring PPC links related to the Complainant's business is an indication of bad faith use of the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.5. Finally, the Respondent has not provided any credible evidence-backed rationale for registering the disputed domain name. Under the circumstances, the Panel does not believe that any such rationale exists.

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 <mederma.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa /

Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa

Sole Panelist

Date: December 20, 2025