

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Upjohn Manufacturing Ireland Unlimited v. jpkLuo  
Case No. D2025-4915

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is UPJOHN MANUFACTURING IRELAND UNLIMITED, Ireland, represented by Viatris, United States of America.

The Respondent is jpkLuo, Taiwan Province of China.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <lipitorpill.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Name SRS AB (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 25, 2025. On November 26, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On November 27, 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 (Privacy Protected) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 27, 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 December 1, 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 11, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 31, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on January 19, 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 Complainant is part of Viartis, a global healthcare company and a division of Pfizer Inc. Pfizer is a global producer of generic and branded pharmaceuticals with distribution in more than 165 countries around the world. Viartis manufactures and markets LIPITOR, a statin medication used to prevent cardiovascular disease.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for LIPITOR around the world, such as European Union Trademark No. 002955003 (registered October 28, 2004) and Vietnamese trademark No. 27159,68467 (registered June 1, 2021).

The Domain Name was registered on August 7, 2025. The Domain Name redirects to a gambling website in Vietnamese.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant provides evidence of trademark registrations and contends that the Domain Name clearly incorporates the Complainant's trademark and the requirements for identical and/or confusingly similar have been satisfied.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Complainant asserts that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant. The Respondent's use of the Domain Name to divert users to a gambling website does not constitute a legitimate interest in the Domain Name. The Respondent never obtained license or permission from the Complainant, and the Respondent has not acquired trademark or service mark rights. The Respondent is not using the Domain Name with a bona fide offering of goods and services. Instead, the Respondent is masquerading as the Complainant with intent for unlawful commercial gain.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent had actual or constructive knowledge of the Complainant's trademark when the Respondent registered the Domain Name. It is supported by the composition of the Domain Name (the word "pill" added to the Complainant's trademark), and the fame of the Complainant's trademark. Moreover, the Respondent's use of the Domain Name creates a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

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 Domain Name. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has established that it has rights in the trademark LIPITOR. In this case, the Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's trademark with the addition of "pill". The addition does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the trademark. For the purpose of assessing under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel may ignore the generic Top-Level Domain. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which a respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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.

Based on the evidence, the Respondent is not affiliated or related to the Complainant in any way. There is no evidence that the Respondent has registered the Domain Name as a trademark or acquired trademark rights. There is no evidence of the Respondent's 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. On the contrary, the use of the Domain Name is rather evidence of bad faith, as discussed below.

The Panel finds also that the composition of the Domain Name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

### **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.

The Respondent most likely knew of the Complainant when it registered the Domain Name. It follows from the fame of the Complainant's trademark and the composition of the Domain Name. The Respondent has not offered any explanation to why it registered a domain name confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, nor provided any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use of the Domain Name. On the contrary, the Respondent's redirection to a Vietnamese gambling website, suggests that the Respondent has

attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to this website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

Based on the available record, 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 Domain Name <lipitorpill.com> be cancelled.

*/Mathias Lilleengen/*

**Mathias Lilleengen**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 23, 2026