

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

BioNTech SE v. Narendranadh Akkina

Case No. D2025-4849

1. The Parties

The Complainant is BioNTech SE, Germany, represented by MSA IP - Milojevic Sekulic & Associates, Serbia.

The Respondent is Narendranadh Akkina, India.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <biontechge.com> and <biontechgelifesciences.com> are registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 21, 2025 in respect of the domain name <biontechge.com>. On November 21, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with that disputed domain name. On the same day, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name <biontechge.com> which differed from the named Respondent (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 25, 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 November 28, 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 December 3, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 23, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 24, 2025.

On December 8, 2025, the Complainant filed a second amended Complaint requesting addition of the disputed domain name <biontechgelifesciences.com> to the proceedings.

The Center appointed Adam Taylor as the sole panelist in this matter on January 6, 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.

On January 19, 2026, upon instruction from the Panel, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name <biontechgelifesciences.com>. On the same day, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent was the registrant of the disputed domain name <biontechgelifesciences.com>.

On January 21, 2026, the Panel issued Procedural Order No.1 ("PO1") inviting inter alia the Respondent to submit any comments it may have on the Complainant's second amended Complaint regarding the addition of the domain name <biontechgelifesciences.com> to the proceedings. The Respondent did not respond.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant, which was founded in 2008, is a biotechnology company that trades under the mark BIONTECH. The company achieved worldwide fame when it co-developed the BioNTech/Pfizer COVID-19 vaccine, with over one billion doses administered worldwide.

The Complainant owns a number of registered trade marks for BIONTECH including European Union Trade Mark No. 008964447, registered on December 22, 2010, in classes 1, 5, 42 and 44.

The Complainant operates a website at "www.biontech.com".

The disputed domain name <biontechge.com> was registered on November 7, 2025.

As of November 19, 2025, the disputed domain name <biontechge.com> resolved to a website branded with similar blue/green Biontech GE and Bio Life Pharmacy logos. The latter included the words "A Unit of BIONTECH GE". The home page was entitled "Nurse-Centric, Patient-Focused, Hospice Pharmacy Solutions" and, in addition to various services, it purported to offer various "Health Kit" and other products for sale and featured a photograph of a medical worker holding a cardboard box with the Biontech GE logo. The "Team" page stated that Biontech GE was a "franchise partner" of Bio Life Pharmacy.

The disputed domain name <biontechgelifesciences.com> was registered on December 3, 2025, the same date when the Complaint regarding the disputed domain name <biontechge.com> was notified to the Respondent.

As of December 8, 2025, the disputed domain name <biontechgelifesciences.com> resolved to a website branded with the same blue/green logos mentioned above, but with the words "life sciences" added to the Biontech GE logo. The home page was entitled "Patient-Focused, Hospice Pharmacy Solutions" and it contained many features similar to the website at the disputed domain name <biontechge.com>, including similar services and a similar overall look and feel as well as the same contact address and some identical photographs in the "Gallery".

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.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issue: Additional Domain Name

Following notification of the Complaint, the Complainant filed a second amended Complaint seeking to add the disputed domain name <biontechgelifesciences.com> to the proceedings.

Except in limited cases where there is clear evidence of respondent gaming/attempts to frustrate the proceedings (e.g., by the registration of domain names after complaint notification), panels are generally reluctant to accept such post-notification requests because the addition of further domain names would delay the proceedings, which are expected to take place with due expedition. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.12.2,

However, in this case there is indeed clear evidence that the Respondent has gamed or attempted to frustrate the proceedings by registering the disputed domain name <biontechgelifesciences.com> on the same day that it was notified of the Complaint regarding, and by using it in a very similar manner to, the disputed domain name <biontechge.com>.

The Panel issued PO1 inviting the Respondent to comment on the second amended Complaint, but it did not do so.

In these circumstances, the Panel considers that it would be fair and equitable to all Parties, and also procedurally efficient, to add the disputed domain name <biontechgelifesciences.com> to these proceedings. Amongst other things, the Panel finds that this would be procedurally efficient.

Accordingly, the Panel has decided to add the disputed domain name <biontechgelifesciences.com> to these proceedings.

6.2 Substantive Issues

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 trade mark and the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark 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 names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "ge" and "lifesciences") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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 recognised 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 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.

As to paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, and as further discussed in section 6.2C below, the Panel considers that the Respondent has used the disputed domain names to intentionally attempt to attract, confuse and profit from Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the websites. Such use of the disputed domain names is not bona fide.

Nor is there any evidence that paragraphs 4(c)(ii) or (iii) of the Policy are relevant in the circumstances of this case.

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 considers that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its websites for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trade mark in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Not only do the disputed domain names include the Complainant’s mark, but the Respondent has used the disputed domain names for websites purportedly operated by a company Biontech GE that prominently uses blue/green logos that are strikingly similar to the Complainant’s mark to offer goods/services that are in, or related to, the Complainant’s industry. While it is unclear whether such a company exists, in any event the incorporation of a company without evidence that it operates a legitimate business does not of itself exclude the possibility that the Respondent selected the name of the company in order to take unfair advantage of another party’s trade mark rights. Noting the Complainant’s substantial media presence and worldwide marketing of its services, and the absence of any explanation by the Respondent for its choice of names, the Panel finds it more probable than not that the disputed domain names were registered with knowledge of the Complainant’s mark and with intent to target it.

Furthermore, the Respondent’s action in registering the disputed domain name <biontechgelifesciences.com> on the same day as it was notified of the Complaint in relation to the disputed domain name <biontechge.com> (by simply adding the term “lifesciences”, a term highly relevant to the

Complainant), is a clear indication of its awareness of the Complainant and, in the Panel's view, an attempt by the Respondent to frustrate these proceedings. These circumstances support a finding of bad faith.

Furthermore, as noted above, the Respondent has not come forward to explain or defend its behaviour.

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

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 <biontechge.com> and <biontechgelifesciences.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Adam Taylor/

Adam Taylor

Sole Panelist

Date: February 5, 2026