

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

The Regents of the University of California v. Mark Leonardo
Case No. D2025-4593

1. The Parties

The Complainant is The Regents of the University of California, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Hanson Bridgett LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Mark Leonardo, South Africa.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ucsfmychart.net> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 6, 2025. On November 6, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name”). On November 6, 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, Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 7, 20265, 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 November 13, 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 November 14, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 4, 2025. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on November 13, 2025.

The Center appointed Nick J. Gardner as the sole panelist in this matter on December 11, 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 The Regents of the University of California, the governing body for the University of California system, including the University of California, San Francisco campus (“UCSF”) and the associated healthcare center named UCSF Health. UCSF has existed as a college since 1864 and has operated under the UCSF name since the 1960s. UCSF Health was ranked in 2022-2023 as the 12th best hospital in the United States.

The Complainant owns various trademark registrations in the United States for the terms UCSF and UCSF HEALTH, including in particular United States Trademark Registration No. 4,099,127, UCSF, registered February 14, 2012 (the “UCSF trademark”)

The Complainant has used the mark UCSF since at least as early as 1969, and has used the mark UCSF HEALTH since at least as early as 2015. The Complainant operates its main websites at “www.ucsf.edu” (registered in 1986) and “www.ucsfhealth.org” (registered in 2000).

The Complainant offers a MyChart mobile app and online portal for UCSF Health patients at “www.ucsfhealth.org/mychart”, allowing patients to make appointments, refill prescriptions, view medical test results, and communicate confidentially with healthcare providers.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on August 9, 2025. At the time of the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to a website (the “Respondent’s Website”) that displayed the Complainant’s UCSF HEALTH and UCFH trademark. The website gives the impression that it is an official UCSF Health MyChart portal, containing information about the mobile app and service, and is written in the first person as if operated by the Complainant (e.g., “UCSF Health understands that...”). The Respondent’s Website also displayed the Complainant’s actual contact information, including the address of the UCSF Health.

The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized or licensed to use the UCSF marks or to register 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.

The Complainant asserts that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to its UCSF trademark. The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the entirety of the Complainant’s UCSF trademark and adds “mychart,” which is the name of the Complainant’s patient portal service. The addition of “mychart” heightens the possibility of confusion as consumers are likely to believe the Disputed Domain Name is associated with the Complainant’s official MyChart service.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent is not known by “ucsfmychart” and is not affiliated with the Complainant. The Complainant has not licensed or permitted the Respondent to use the UCSF marks or any domain names incorporating them.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith. The website associated with the Disputed Domain Name displays unauthorized UCSF and UCSF HEALTH trademarks and falsely presents itself as an official UCSF Health MyChart portal. The Respondent's Website uses the Complainant's actual contact information and appears designed to mislead individuals seeking UCSF Health services, likely for the purpose of obtaining confidential and sensitive information, including medical records and financial information (phishing). This use constitutes impersonation and fraudulent activity.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not file a formal Response to the Complainant's contentions. On November 13, 2025, the Respondent sent an informal email communication to the Center stating: "the domain in questions is not associated with ucsf mychart but only serves as a means to share educational information about UCSF MyChart. The disclaimer is boldy written on the footer section and in between posts, its not created in bad faith nor use to get information from viewers. And UCSF MyChart is given the total credits, ucsfmychart.net site is just to educate viewers."

However, the Respondent did not provide any evidence to support these claims and did not file a formal Response.

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, in accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical with 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;
- (iii) the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established rights in the UCSF trademark. The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's UCSF trademark in its entirety and adds the term "mychart", which is the name of the Complainant's patient portal service.

It is well-established that where a Disputed Domain Name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark for purposes of UDRP standing. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7. The addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".net" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and may be disregarded under the confusing similarity test. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Panel finds the UCSF trademark is, on the evidence before the Panel, a term in which the Complainant has developed a significant reputation.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances any of which is sufficient to demonstrate that a respondent has rights or legitimate interests in a domain name:

(i) before any notice to the respondent of the dispute, use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

(ii) the respondent has been commonly known by the domain name, even if the respondent has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) the respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

None of these apply in the present circumstances. The Complainant has not authorised, licensed, or permitted the Respondent to register or use the Disputed Domain Name or to use the UCSF trademark. The Complainant has prior rights in the UCSF trademark which precede the Respondent's acquisition of the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant has therefore established a prima facie case that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name and thereby the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to produce evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name (see, for example, *Do The Hustle, LLC v. Tropic Web*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0624](#); *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0455](#)).

The Panel finds that the Respondent has failed to produce any evidence to establish his rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Panel does not accept the explanation offered by the Respondent in his informal communication with the Center (see above). The Respondent's Website is not a legitimate "educational" use – it provides information about the Complainant, but importantly it masquerades as being the Complainant's official website. The Panel has also considered the fact that the Respondent's Website carries a disclaimer. The Panel does not consider this assists the Respondent. It is not particularly prominent and a visitor has to scroll down a considerable distance to find it. This issue is discussed in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) at paragraph 3.7: "How does a disclaimer on the webpage to which a disputed domain name resolves impact a panel's assessment of bad faith?"

"In cases where the respondent appears to otherwise have a right or legitimate interest in a disputed domain name, a clear and sufficiently prominent disclaimer would lend support to circumstances suggesting its good faith. For example, where a respondent is legitimately providing goods or services related to the complainant's mark only (see *Oki Data* and its progeny discussed at 2.8), the presence of a clear and sufficiently prominent disclaimer can support a finding that the respondent has undertaken reasonable steps to avoid unfairly passing itself off as related to the complainant, or to otherwise confuse users.

On the other hand, where the overall circumstances of a case point to the respondent's bad faith, the mere existence of a disclaimer cannot cure such bad faith. In such cases, panels may consider the respondent's use of a disclaimer as an admission by the respondent that users may be confused."

For the reasons discussed above the Panel does not consider the Respondent has a right or legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name and accordingly the Panel does not consider the disclaimer, even if it was more prominent, assists the Respondent. In this regard, the addition of "mychart" to the UCSF trademark in the Disputed Domain Name actually heightens the likelihood of confusion, as "MyChart" is the specific name of the Complainant's patient portal service. The composition of the Disputed Domain Name creates the false impression that it is an official domain name for accessing the UCSF Health MyChart service. Accordingly, the Panel finds the Respondent has no rights or any legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name and the second condition of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been fulfilled.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

In the present circumstances the evidence as to the extent of the reputation the Complainant enjoys in the UCSF trademark, and the fact that the Disputed Domain Name was linked to the Respondent's Website which impersonated the Complainant's own website lead the Panel to conclude the registration and use were in bad faith.

The Panel concludes that the Respondent chose to register a domain name comprising the Complainant's trademark combined with the word "mychart", which is the name of the Complainant's portal service, in order to facilitate a scheme where the Respondent's Website impersonated that of the Complainant.

Under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy a non-exhaustive list of factors evidencing registration and use in bad faith comprises:

- (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 web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your web site or location or of a product or service on your web site or location.

The Panel finds that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name with knowledge of the Complainant's UCSF and UCSF HEALTH trademarks. The Disputed Domain Name was registered in August 2025, more than 50 years after the Complainant began using its UCSF marks and more than 20 years after the Complainant registered its <ucsf.edu> and <ucsfhealth.org> domain names. The Complainant's marks are well-known in connection with a major university and healthcare system. Furthermore, the specific incorporation of both "UCSF" and "MyChart" in the Disputed Domain Name demonstrates actual knowledge. "MyChart" is not a generic term; it is the specific name of the Complainant's patient portal service. The Respondent could only have selected this combination of terms with knowledge of the Complainant and its services.

The use of the Disputed Domain Name confirms bad faith. The Respondent's Website displayed the Complainant's trademarks without authorization, was designed to appear as connected to the official UCSF Health MyChart portal, used first-person language suggesting it was operated by the Complainant, and displayed the Complainant's actual contact information. This is a classic case of impersonation designed to deceive Internet users into believing they are accessing the Complainant's official service.

Such impersonation is inherently in bad faith. The apparent purpose is to collect sensitive personal information from patients who believe they are accessing their medical records through the Complainant's official portal – a practice known as phishing. This constitutes fraudulent and illegal activity.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, phishing, impersonation/passing off, and fraud) constitutes bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. See *Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Limited v. Bashar Ltd*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-0031](#), and the cases therein referred to, for further analysis of why "phishing" activities amount to use in bad faith. See also *Grupo Financiero Inbursa S.A. de CV v ibuirisa*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0614](#) to similar effect.

The Respondent's unsupported claim that the website was "educational" does not alter this finding. The evidence demonstrates at least clear impersonation of the Complainant, with the apparent intent to deceive users and obtain sensitive personal and medical information. Further a disclaimer does not legitimize such otherwise clearly impersonating use (see discussion above).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith and the third condition of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been fulfilled.

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 <ucsfmychart.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nick J. Gardner/

Nick J. Gardner

Sole Panelist

Date: December 23, 2025