

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Neurocrine Biosciences, Inc. v. Deji Mexiscana, Name Redacted
Case No. D2025-5234

1. The Parties

Complainant is Neurocrine Biosciences, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Fross Zelnick Lehrman & Zissu, P.C., United States.

Respondent is Deji Mexiscana, Name redacted¹, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <neurocrine-inc.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 15, 2025. On December 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 17, 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 (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf,) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on December 17, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on December 22, 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

¹ The Respondent appears to have used the organization name of a third party when registering the Disputed Domain Name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent’s name from this Decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this Decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the Disputed Domain Name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in these proceedings and has indicated that Annex 1 to this Decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 29, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 18, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on January 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Jeffrey M. Samuels as the sole panelist in this matter on January 22, 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

Complainant Neurocrine Biosciences, Inc. is a pharmaceutical company that focuses on discovering and developing pharmaceuticals for the treatment of various diseases and disorders. Its portfolio includes treatments for tardive dyskinesia and cholera associated with Huntington’s disease.

Complainant was founded in 1992, and since that time has been doing business under the name “neurocrine”. The NEUROCRINE trademark was registered with the United States Patent and Trademark Office on May 28, 2019 (Reg. No. 5,762,521); May 28, 2019 (Reg. No. 5,762,522); and June 27, 2023 (Reg. No. 7,093,757). Complainant also owns registrations for its NEUROCRINE mark in other jurisdictions around the world.

Complainant has engaged in extensive marketing efforts promoting its NEUROCRINE trademark, with articles appearing in numerous third-party publications, including Forbes and The New York Times. Complainant has over 80,000 followers on LinkedIn.

The disputed domain name, <neurocrine-inc.com>, was registered on October 30, 2025. Emails sent from addresses that incorporated the term “neurocrine” were sent by Respondent to companies with whom Complainant had no business relationship to place orders for various products. Complainant wrote to the Registrar of the disputed domain name on November 14, 2025, requesting that the disputed domain name be suspended to prevent further allegedly fraudulent use.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

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

Notably, Complainant contends that there can be no dispute that it has strong rights in the NEUROCRINE trademark, which it has used around the world for decades.

Complainant next asserts that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the NEUROCRINE mark. It points out that the disputed domain name incorporates the mark in full, adding only the generic corporate identifier “inc.” and the generic Top-Level Domain “.com.”

Complainant maintains that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. According to Complainant, Respondent has no affiliation or connection with Complainant and has not received any license or consent to use Complainant’s trademark in a domain name or in any other manner.

Upon information and belief, Respondent's only use of the disputed domain name is to send fraudulent emails from [...]@neurocrine-inc.com in an attempt to place orders for products from companies from whom Complainant would not normally place orders and to redirect delivery of such products to addresses unassociated with Complainant. "Such use demonstrates neither a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate interest," Complainant declares.

Complainant further alleges that there is no evidence Respondent has made actual use of the disputed domain name in connection with an active, independent website or that Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

With respect to the issue of "bad faith" registration and use, Complainant argues that, given that the NEUROCRINE mark is well known within the industry and enjoys widespread international recognition, "[i]t is ... inconceivable that Respondent was unaware of the NEUROCRINE Marks when it registered the Domain Name." Respondent's awareness of the NEUROCRINE mark is further established by the fact that Respondent used the disputed domain name to impersonate one of Complainant's employees by sending emails from the infringing domain name to order goods in Complainant's name. This all "suggests Respondent's opportunistic bad faith in registering the Domain Name" for "financial gain by perpetrating a fraud" on Complainant.

Complainant notes that the disputed domain name is not currently being used with an active website but contends that such non-use can constitute bad faith registration and use under the Policy.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

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.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark 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 name. The addition of the generic term "inc." and ".com" do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.8 and 1.11.

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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here, the use of the disputed domain name to send fraudulent emails allegedly emanating from Complainant in an attempt to purchase certain goods, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1. The email included with the case file reveals not only use of the term "neurocrine" in the email address but also repeated use of Complainant's name "Neurocrine Biosciences" in the email itself.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, for the reasons set forth above, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The fact that the disputed domain name resolves to an inactive website does not change the result. As noted above, Complainant has established trademark rights in its NEUROCRINE trademark and, given the nature of Respondent's fraudulent use of such mark in connection with an email address, it is beyond doubt that Respondent was aware of and targeted Complainant and its mark.

The Panel finds that 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 name <neurocrine-inc.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Jeffrey M. Samuels/

Jeffrey M. Samuels

Sole Panelist

Date: January 30, 2026