

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sanofi v. Nikhil Nainwani, MagicallyGenius
Case No. D2025-5062

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Nikhil Nainwani, MagicallyGenius, India.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <gosanofi.shop> and <mysanofi.shop> are registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 5, 2025. On December 5, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On December 5, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 8, 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 11, 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 16, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for the Response was January 5, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on December 11, 2025.

The Center appointed Reyes Campello Estebaranz as the sole panelist in this matter on January 14, 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 a leading French multinational pharmaceutical company, operating in more than 180 countries worldwide, including India and the United States of America ("United States"), and employing over 90,000 people. It is renowned for its research and development, manufacture, and commercialization of prescription medicines and over-the-counter products under various trademarks, and holds a leading position in major therapeutic areas, including cardiovascular diseases, thrombosis, metabolic disorders, oncology, central nervous system disorders, internal medicine, and vaccines.

The Complainant has been recognized as a leading pharmaceutical company by publications such as the annual L2 Digital IQ Index: Pharmabrand & Healthcare Providers (2011), and its SANOFI trademark has been acknowledged as an internationally well-known mark in numerous prior UDRP decisions.¹

The Complainant uses the SANOFI mark to identify its company, services, and activities, including its media relations through its corporate website. It holds numerous trademark registrations for the SANOFI mark worldwide, either alone or in combination with design elements, of which the following registrations are representative for the purposes of the present proceeding:

- European Union Trade Mark Reg. No. 010167351, SANOFI, registered on January 7, 2012, in classes 3, and 5;
- European Union Trade Mark Reg. No. 004182325, SANOFI, registered on February 9, 2006, in classes 1, 9, 10, 16, 38, 41, 42, and 44;
- European Union Trade Mark Reg. No. 00596023, SANOFI, figurative, registered on February 1, 1999, in classes 3 and 5;
- International Trademark Reg. No. 1091805, SANOFI, figurative, registered on August 18, 2011, in classes 1, 3, 5, 9, 10, 16, 35, 38, 40, 41, 42, and 44;
- International Trademark Reg. No. 1092811, SANOFI, registered on August 11, 2011, in classes 1, 9, 10, 16, 38, 41, 42, and 44;
- International Trademark Reg. No. 674936, SANOFI, registered on June 11, 1997, in classes 3 and 5;
- International Trademark Reg. No. 591490, SANOFI, figurative, registered on September 25, 1992, in class 5; and
- United States Trademark Reg. No. 85396658, SANOFI, registered on July 24, 2012, in classes 3, 5, 9, 10, 16, 35, 41, 42, and 44.

(Hereinafter collectively referred to as the "SANOFI mark").

¹ The Complainant cites, among others, *Sanofi v. Domain Admin, Whoisprotection.cc / Jose Flora, Waeco mart ltd*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1857](#); *Sanofi v. Aamir Hitawala*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1781](#); *Sanofi v. Yansheng zhang, GNAME.COM PTE. LTD*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1751](#); *Sanofi v. Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0161263426 / Mike Willis, Sanofi Pasteur*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-1320](#); *Sanofi v. li yue rong (李玥蓉)*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0649](#); *Sanofi v. WhoisGuard Protected, WhoisGuard, Inc. / Rate funds, [Name Redacted]*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0318](#); and *Sanofi v. HUANG GUANGJIN aka HUANGGUANGJIN*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-0814](#).

The Complainant also owns numerous domain names that comprise or incorporate its SANOFI mark, most of which are used in connection with its services, activities, and media relations, including <sanofi.com> (registered on October 13, 1995), <sanofi.eu> (registered on March 12, 2006), <sanofi.fr> (registered on October 10, 2006), <sanofi.us> (registered on May 16, 2002), <sanofi.net> (registered on May 16, 2003), <sanofi.ca> (registered on January 5, 2004), <sanofi.biz> (registered on November 17, 2001), <sanofi.info> (registered on August 24, 2001), <sanofi.org> (registered on July 12, 2001), <sanofi.mobi> (registered on June 20, 2006), and <sanofi.tel> (registered on March 17, 2011).

The disputed domain names were registered on November 27, 2025, and both redirect to the same website, an English-language site that purports to offer services and artificial intelligence tools in the field of Customer Relationship Management (“CRM”). The website states in its content, as well as in its “Terms of Service,” “Privacy Policy,” and “Cookie Policy” sections, that it is owned and/or operated by an artificial intelligence company incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware, United States. The website’s copyright notice reads “© 2026 [Company name]. All rights reserved.” The website makes no reference to the SANOFI mark or the Complainant, and it does not include any information or disclaimer regarding the absence of any relationship with them.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names.

In particular, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its SANOFI mark, as they each wholly incorporate the trademark, preceded by the terms “my” or “go,” which do not eliminate the likelihood of confusion. The Complainant further argues that the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.shop” should be disregarded, as it does not serve to avoid a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Respondent has no authorization for using the SANOFI mark, there is no relationship between the Parties, and the disputed domain names are not used in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services or any legitimate activity. The disputed domain names are used for commercial gain by misleading and diverting Internet users to a third party’s website. This use of the disputed domain names tarnishes the Complainant’s worldwide goodwill and reputation.

The Complainant finally contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. Due to the worldwide reputation of the SANOFI mark, the Respondent must have had, at least, constructive, if not actual notice, as to the existence of this trademark at the time he registered the disputed domain names, and targeted the mark with opportunistic bad faith, to profit from its international reputation and goodwill. The disputed domain names are also used in bad faith to mislead and divert Internet users to a third party’s website, increasing its traffic for financial gain.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not submit a Response to the Complainant’s contentions. On December 11, 2025, the Respondent sent an informal email communication to the Center stating only, “What is this about?” and did not contact the Center again after receiving the notification and full information regarding the proceeding.

6. Discussion and Findings

The Complainant has made the relevant assertions as required by the Policy and the dispute is properly within the scope of the Policy. The Panel has authority to decide the dispute examining the three elements

in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, taking into consideration all of the relevant evidence, annexed materials and allegations, and performing some limited independent research under the general powers of the Panel articulated, *inter alia*, in paragraph 10 of the Rules.

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

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy, namely the SANOFI mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the SANOFI mark is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain names, as each incorporates the mark in its entirety. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of the terms "my" and "go" may be relevant to the assessment of the second and third elements under the Policy, the Panel finds that such additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the SANOFI mark. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Consequently, 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 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.

The Panel notes that the term "sanofi" is a coined term with no dictionary meaning, and that neither the Respondent nor its organization, identified as "MagicallyGenius," bears any resemblance to this term or to the expressions contained in the disputed domain names ("go sanofi", or "gosanofi", "my sanofi", or "mysanofi").

The Panel further confirms, based on searches of the Global Brand Database, that neither the Respondent nor its organization holds any trademark rights corresponding to the disputed domain names.²

The Panel also observes that the disputed domain names redirect to a third party's website operating in a field entirely unrelated to the Complainant and its SANOFI mark. Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services under the Policy and cannot confer rights or legitimate interests. The use of the disputed domain name to increase the traffic to an unrelated third party's website unrelated to the mark, presumably for a commercial gain derived from the unfair or unjustified increase in traffic to that site, cannot confer rights or legitimate interests under the Policy. See, e.g., *LogMeIn, Inc. v. Nanci Nette*, WIPO Case No. [DME2019-0007](#); or *LEGO Juris A/S v. zxc abc, StacyJo Mest, dasdfas fsafas, Tami Moore, kylee Ghabour, bret Pugh*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-2213](#) ("[...] noting the broader circumstances of this case including the incorporation of the widely-known LEGO mark, the use of the disputed domain name <legocome.xyz> to redirect to a website offering unrelated third-party goods does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or service, or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.").

Furthermore, the composition of the disputed domain names, which wholly incorporate the well-known SANOFI mark, carries a risk of implied affiliation and cannot constitute fair use, as it suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. See, e.g., *Columbia Insurance Company v. Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-0528](#); and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

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 Panel finds that the circumstances of this case clearly demonstrate that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

Given the worldwide reputation of the SANOFI mark, its recognition in numerous prior UDRP decisions,³ and the fact that "sanofi" is a coined term with no apparent connection to the Respondent, the Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's trademark at the time of registration, and, most likely, targeted this mark with opportunistic bad faith.

Additionally, the Respondent has not come forward to rebut the Complainant's allegations of bad faith, and nothing in the record indicates that he may have any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names.

The Panel further finds that the use of the disputed domain names to redirect Internet users to an unrelated third party's website creates a likelihood of confusion and suggests an intent to profit from such confusion and from the reputation of the SANOFI mark. Such conduct falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, which provides that bad faith exists where a respondent intentionally attempts to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with a complainant's trademark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

² Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated *inter alia* in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the UDRP Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.8.

³ See footnote number 1.

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 <gosanofi.shop> and <mysanofi.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Reyes Campello Estebaranz/

Reyes Campello Estebaranz

Sole Panelist

Date: January 28, 2026