

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sanofi v. ricardo ramos luna, nissan
Case No. D2025-4940

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Sanofi, France, represented by Selarl Marchais & Associés, France.

The Respondent is ricardo ramos luna, nissan, Mexico.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <farmasanofiaventis.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on November 26, 2025. On November 27, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 2, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 3, 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 amendment to the Complaint on December 4, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 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 Marcello Do Nascimento 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, Sanofi, is a global pharmaceutical group headquartered in Paris, France. Sanofi was formed in 2004 following the merger of Sanofi-Synthelabo and Aventis, and operated for several years under the corporate name Sanofi-Aventis, before adopting the name Sanofi in 2011. The Complainant is active worldwide in the research, development, manufacturing, and commercialization of pharmaceutical products, including prescription and over-the-counter medicines and vaccines, and maintains a significant presence in more than 100 countries worldwide.

The Complaint is based on the Complainant's trademark rights in the designations SANOFI and SANOFI-AVENTIS, which long predate the registration of the disputed domain name. As evidenced by the documentation submitted under Annex 8, the Complainant owns a substantial portfolio of national, regional, and international trademark registrations covering pharmaceutical products and related goods and services. In particular, the Complainant relies on the following trademark registrations, as submitted with the Complaint and verified by the Panel:

- French trademark SANOFI (+ device), Registration No. 3831592, registered on May 16, 2011, covering goods and services in International Classes 1, 3, 5, 9, 10, 16, 35, 38, 40, 41, 42 and 44 (Annex 8);
- International trademark SANOFI, Registration No. 591490, registered on September 25, 1992 (Annex 8).
- International trademark SANOFI-AVENTIS, Registration No. 839358, registered on October 1, 2004, covering goods and services in International Classes 1, 3, 5, 9, 10, 16, 38, 41, 42, and 44 (Annex 8);

The Panel notes that all of the above trademark registrations were obtained well before the registration of the disputed domain name and are valid and in force. The Complainant is the owner of these trademark registrations.

The Complainant also maintains a longstanding online presence and owns numerous domain names incorporating its trademarks, as evidenced by the annexes submitted with the Complaint, including, inter alia, the domain names <sanofi.com>, <sanofi.eu>, and <sanofi.fr>, as well as additional generic and country-code Top-Level Domain names reflecting the SANOFI and SANOFI-AVENTIS designations.

The disputed domain name, <farmasanofiaventis.com>, was registered on November 24, 2025.

At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a parking page, displaying sponsored and promotional content unrelated to the Complainant. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name no longer resolves to an active website and instead leads to an inactive or error page. There is no evidence in the record that the Respondent has made any bona fide or legitimate use of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent initially registered the disputed domain name using a privacy service. Following Registrar verification, the Registrar disclosed the underlying registrant information, identifying the Respondent as ricardo ramos luna, with an address in Mexico. The Complaint was amended accordingly. There is no evidence of any relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant, nor of any authorization granted to the Respondent to use the Complainant's trademarks.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the three elements required under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name, <farmasanofiaventis.com>, is confusingly similar to its well-established trademarks SANOFI and SANOFI-AVENTIS, which are reproduced in their entirety and constitute the dominant and distinctive elements of the disputed domain name. The Complainant argues that the mere addition of the descriptive term "farma", which directly refers to the pharmaceutical field in which the Complainant operates, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. On the contrary, such term reinforces the association with the Complainant and increases the likelihood that Internet users will believe that the disputed domain name is associated with, sponsored by, or affiliated with the Complainant.

The Complainant further submits that the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is irrelevant for the purpose of assessing confusing similarity and should be disregarded in the comparison.

The Complainant maintains that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not commonly known by the name "Sanofi" or "Sanofi-Aventis" and has never been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to use its trademarks or to register any domain name incorporating them. The Complainant emphasizes that no business, contractual, or other relationship exists between the Parties.

The Complainant further argues that the Respondent has not used, nor made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a parking page displaying sponsored links, and at the time of this Decision it no longer resolves to an active website. According to the Complainant, such use — or lack thereof — does not constitute a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy, particularly where the domain name incorporates a highly distinctive and well-known trademark.

The Complainant also contends that the composition of the disputed domain name, combining the SANOFI-AVENTIS trademark with a term directly linked to the pharmaceutical sector, creates a clear implied false affiliation. The Complainant submits that such composition is likely to mislead Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name is an official or authorized online channel of the Complainant.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant submits that its trademark rights long predate the registration of the disputed domain name and that the SANOFI and SANOFI-AVENTIS trademarks are widely known worldwide. In the Complainant's view, the deliberate registration of a domain name incorporating its distinctive trademarks demonstrates that the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant and intentionally targeted its brand at the time of registration.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent's passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith. The Complainant relies on established UDRP principles and prior panel decisions recognizing that, in appropriate circumstances, the passive holding of a domain name incorporating a well-known trademark may constitute bad faith registration and use.

In light of the foregoing, the Complainant submits that the requirements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are met and requests that the disputed domain name be cancelled, in accordance with paragraph 4(i) of the Policy.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not submit any Response to the Complaint. Accordingly, the Respondent has not contested the Complainants' assertions nor provided any evidence of rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, nor any explanation regarding its registration or use.

6. Discussion and Findings

Pursuant to paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted, in accordance with the Policy, the Rules, and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove, on the balance of probabilities, each of the following elements:

- a) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- b) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- c) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel addresses each element in turn.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has established rights in the trademarks SANOFI and SANOFI-AVENTIS through numerous national, regional, and international trademark registrations.

The disputed domain name, <farmasanofiaventis.com>, incorporates the trademark SANOFI-AVENTIS in its entirety with the omission of the hyphen. The Panel also finds that the trademark SANOFI is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to trademarks in which the Complainant has rights for the purposes of the Policy. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Panel finds that the addition of the descriptive term "farma", which directly refers to the pharmaceutical field in which the Complainant operates, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. It is well established that where a domain name wholly incorporates a complainant's trademark, the addition of dictionary, descriptive, or other terms does not avoid confusing similarity (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8).

The gTLD ".com" is disregarded for the purposes of the confusing similarity analysis (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1).

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to trademarks in which the Complainant has rights and that the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy sets out circumstances by which a respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. While the overall burden of proof rests with the Complainant, once a prima facie case is established, the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the Respondent fails to do so, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

The Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The record shows that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the SANOFI or SANOFI-AVENTIS trademarks, and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. There is no evidence that the Respondent holds any trademark or service mark rights corresponding to the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website and has not been used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Nor is there any evidence of legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Given the composition of the disputed domain name — combining the Complainant's trademark SANOFI-AVENTIS with a term directly related to the pharmaceutical sector — the Panel finds that the disputed domain name carries a clear risk of implied affiliation.

The Respondent did not submit a Response and has therefore failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case or demonstrate any rights or legitimate interests under paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The second element of the Policy is therefore satisfied.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a non-exhaustive list of circumstances that may indicate that a domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. Panels have consistently held that other circumstances, beyond those expressly listed, may also be relevant in assessing bad faith registration and use. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant's SANOFI and SANOFI-AVENTIS trademarks are long-established, and widely known worldwide, and they significantly predate the registration of the disputed domain name in November 2025. In light of the global reputation and recognition of the Complainant's trademarks, it is implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its rights at the time of registration.

The deliberate selection of a domain name that reproduces the Complainant's SANOFI-AVENTIS trademark in its entirety, combined with the term "farma", which directly refers to the pharmaceutical field in which the Complainant operates, strongly supports the conclusion that the Respondent intentionally targeted the Complainant's trademarks when registering the disputed domain name.

The Panel further notes that the terms "Sanofi" and "Aventis" do not have any common or descriptive meaning. Panels have repeatedly recognized that the SANOFI trademark, in particular, constitutes a well-known mark for the purposes of the Policy. See, e.g., *Sanofi v. Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-3114](#). This further supports the conclusion that the Respondent could not have registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks and with an intent to target the Complainant's rights.

The Panel further observes that, at the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a parking page. Panels have repeatedly held that the use of a domain name incorporating a well-known trademark to resolve to a parking page may constitute evidence of bad faith, particularly where such use is capable of generating commercial benefit, whether through sponsored links, pay-per-click ("PPC") revenue, or other monetization mechanisms, even if such links are automatically generated by the registrar or a third party. In such circumstances, the Respondent remains responsible for the use made of the disputed domain name. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.5.

Although the disputed domain name is currently inactive, the Panel recalls that the non- use does not prevent a finding of bad faith. As established in *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#), passive holding of a domain name may, in appropriate circumstances, constitute bad faith registration and use. See also [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

Having reviewed the totality of the circumstances of this case, the Panel considers the following factors to be particularly relevant:

- (i) the well-known and global reputation of the Complainant's trademarks;
- (ii) the reproduction of the Complainant's trademark in its entirety within the disputed domain name;
- (iii) the unlikelihood of any good-faith use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent;
- (iv) the prior use of the disputed domain name in connection with a parking page capable of generating commercial benefit; and
- (v) the Respondent's failure to submit any Response or to provide any explanation for the choice and registration of the disputed domain name.

In the Panel's view, any potential use of the disputed domain name combining the Complainant's well-known trademarks with a term suggesting pharmaceutical activities would almost inevitably mislead Internet users and falsely imply an affiliation with, endorsement by, or authorization from the Complainant.

The Respondent's failure to participate in the proceedings or to rebut the Complainant's allegations further reinforces the inference that the disputed domain name was registered and is being held in bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 <farmasanofiaventis.com> be cancelled.

/Marcello Do Nascimento/

Marcello Do Nascimento

Sole Panelist

Date: February 2, 2026