

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Perrigo Pharma International DAC, Laboratoire HRA Pharma SAS v. Justin R and Yiwei Ren

Case No. D2025-4704

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Perrigo Pharma International DAC, Ireland, and Laboratoire HRA Pharma SAS, France, represented by Global IP Counselors, Belgium.

The Respondents are Justin R (Respondent 1) and Yiwei Ren (Respondent 2), China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <mederma.store> and <perrigo.store> are registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (Registrar 1) and <mederma.site> is registered with Atak Domain Hosting Internet ve Bilgi Teknolojileri Limited Sirketi d/b/a Atak Teknoloji (Registrar 2) (hereinafter, all together the "Registrars").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed against the Respondent 2 with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on November 13, 2025 in relation to the disputed domain names and to <mederma.shop> registered with Alibaba.com Singapore E-commerce Private Limited.

On November 13, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the four disputed domain names. On November 13, 2025, Registrar 1 transmitted by email to the Center its verification response indicating that Respondent 1 is listed as the registrant for the disputed domain names <mederma.store> and <perrigo.store>. On November 14, 2025, Registrar 2 transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that Respondent 2 is listed as the registrant for the disputed domain name <mederma.site>. The contact details provided by the Registrars show that both Respondents have the same address. On November 14, 2025, Alibaba.com Singapore E-commerce Private Limited transmitted by email to the Center its verification response showing that the disputed domain name <mederma.shop> was not owned by the Respondents but by a third party.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on November 21, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints for the disputed 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 Complainants filed an amended Complaint on November 26, 2025 targeting only the disputed domain names owned by the Respondents in the present proceedings. A separate complaint was filed for <mederma.shop>.

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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 29, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent default on February 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Theda König Horowicz as the sole panelist in this matter on February 12, 2026. 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 Complainants are part of the Perrigo group of companies. The Perrigo group is an over-the-counter self-care pharmaceutical enterprise conducting business on a global scale which was founded at the end of the nineteenth century in Italy. The Perrigo group has evolved into an international pharmaceutical conglomerate specializing in the development, manufacture, and commercialization of branded and private label self-care products, which are made available to consumers through retail establishments, pharmacy outlets, and electronic commerce platforms throughout the United States, across the European continent, and in other significant commercial markets worldwide.

The Complainant Laboratoire HRA Pharma SAS, owner of the MEDERMA trademark, was acquired by the Perrigo Group in 2021. For the sake of clarity and to simplify, the Complainants are hereinafter referred to as “The Complainant”.

The Complainant is the owner of trademark registrations for the trademarks PERRIGO and MEDERMA, including:

- United States trademark MEDERMA No 3233153 registered in class 5 on April 24, 2007
- United States trademark PERRIGO No 3823823 registered in class 40 on July 27, 2010.

The disputed domain names were registered simultaneously that is

- <mederma.site> on September 23, 2025
- <mederma.store> and <perrigo.store> on September 24, 2025.

At the time of the filing Complaint, the disputed domain names resolved to a landing page and are offered for sale for a price of USD 1,450.00 each.

The Respondent 2 registered in the past two other domain names containing the trademarks PERRIGO and MEDERMA which were transferred to the Complainant (*Perrigo Pharma International DAC, Laboratoire HRA Pharma SAS v. 诉 □ 艺伟 (Yi Wei Ren)* WIPO Case No. [DME2025-0017](#), decision dated August 25, 2025).

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contend that the disputed domain names contain either its mark PERRIGO or MEDERMA and are therefore confusingly similar.

The Complainant further alleges that the Respondents do not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names notably since (i) they do not own trademark rights in the said names (ii) they reproduce the Complainant's earlier trademarks PERRIGO or MEDERMA without authorization of any kind (iii) they do not make any bona fide offering of goods or services under the disputed domain names which are offered for sale for USD 1,450.00 each.

The Complainant finally contends that the Respondents registered and are using the disputed domain names in bad faith in particular because (i) they knew the Complainant's rights in the trademarks PERRIGO and MEDERMA when registering the disputed domain names (ii) the disputed domain names were registered almost at the same date and the Respondent 2 already registered two other domain names containing MEDERMA and PERRIGO which were transferred to the Complainants (iii) the disputed domain name are all offered for sale.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to two nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the two registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control, notably because

- (i) they have the same address and phone number
- (ii) the disputed domain names were registered simultaneously, almost at the same date
- (iii) the Respondent 2 already registered two other domain names comprising its trademarks PERRIGO and MEDERMA which were then transferred to the Complainant
- (iv) the disputed domain names all resolve to a landing page of the same registrar and are offered for sale for the same price of USD 1'450.00 each.

The Complainant therefore requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

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 Select UDRP Questions, (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that for the reasons mentioned by the Complainant and which are outlined above, it is very likely that the Respondents are indeed connected.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party, particularly to the Respondents who both chose not to participate in any way in these proceedings.

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

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the trademark PERRIGO and MEDERMA for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the marks PERRIGO and MEDERMA are entirely copied without any additions and are therefore clearly recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are identical to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 with the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that domain names identical to a complainant’s trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. The Respondents have registered disputed domain names identical to two of the Complainant’s trademarks, which carry a risk of implied affiliation.

Additionally, the Respondents defaulted and have failed to prove that before any notice of the dispute, their use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names or a name corresponding to the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Furthermore, nothing in the case file shows that the Respondent would be commonly known by the disputed domain names or has acquired any trademark or service mark rights.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondents were obviously aware of Complainant's trademarks MEDERMA and PERRIGO when registering the disputed domain names, not only because these marks have been registered and used since decades by the Complainant but also because the Respondent already unduly registered two other domain names comprising MEDERMA and PERRIGO which were transferred to the Complainant (*Perrigo Pharma International DAC, Laboratoire HRA Pharma SAS v. 诉 □ 艺伟 (Yi Wei Ren)* WIPO Case No. [DME2025-0017](#)).

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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have held that registering without authorization domain names containing third parties trademarks for the sole intent of selling them and profit from its identity (in this case) or confusing similarity with the Complainant's trademark constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.1.

That the Respondent has acted in bad faith is also supported by the fact that it has a pattern of having been found to have registered and used domain names in bad faith based on the marks and names of others. Such pattern is established by several UDRP decisions finding that the Respondent acted in bad faith. These decisions confirm that the Respondent's likely intent here is to likewise deceive consumers by taking advantage of the Complainants' reputation and rights for the profit of the Respondent. See e.g. *FINANCIERE OUI CARE v. YIWEI REN*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2369](#); *Société Coopérative Agricole Limagrain v. Yiwei Ren, Yiwei*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-4132](#); *Pluxee International v. Yiwei Ren*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-4166](#).

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names 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 names <mederma.site>, <mederma.store> and <perrigo.store> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Theda König Horowicz/

Theda König Horowicz

Sole Panelist

Date: March 6, 2026