

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Varian Medical Systems, Inc. v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2025-5427

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Varian Medical Systems, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Sideman & Bancroft, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Name Redacted.¹

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <variansystemsmedical.com> (the "Domain Name") 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 30, 2025. On December 30, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On December 30, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name that differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 30, 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 January 2, 2026.

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 Considering the alleged impersonation in the registration details of the Domain Name, the Panel has redacted the registrant's name from this decision. The Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this decision an order to the Registrar providing for transfer of the Domain Name that includes the name of the registrant disclosed by the Registrar. The Panel has directed the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding, but has further directed that Annex 1 to this Decision not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case.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 the Respondent of the Complaint and the Amended Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 26, 2026. The Center received an email communication on January 21, 2026, that appears, on its face, to be from the impersonated Complainant employee at his email address with the Complainant.

The Center appointed A. Justin Ourso III as the sole panelist in this matter on February 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.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant, a Delaware corporation headquartered in Palo Alto, California, is a leading global manufacturer of medical devices and software used in cancer treatment, which has operated under its VARIAN mark, and VARIAN-formative marks since 1948.

The Complainant owns United States registration, No. 828,848, for its VARIAN trademark, issued on May 16, 1967, for various medical devices in Class 10; United States registration, No. 836,706, for its VARIAN trademark, issued on October 10, 1967, for various medical devices in Class 9; United States registration No. 6,540,384, for its VARIAN trademark, issued on October 26, 2021, for, inter alia, downloadable computer software in the medical field; medical devices; installation, maintenance, and repair services for medical devices, and similar services; training services for medical devices, and related services; and installation, maintenance, and repair services for computer software, and related and other services, in Classes 9, 10, 37, 41, and 42, respectively, and other goods and services in other classes; and other registrations. The Complainant owns the domain name <varian.com> and historically has operated a web site at “www.varian.com,” which it has used as its primary corporate website, through which it has advertised its goods and services. Subsequent to the Complainant’s acquisition by Siemens Healthineers AG, the domain name redirects to a Siemens Healthineers website advertising its VARIAN branded goods and services. The Complainant’s employees use email addresses with “@varian.com” in the ordinary course of business. The Respondent registered the Domain Name on November 11, 2025, and, within two weeks, on November 25, 2025, used the Domain Name to send an email impersonating a Complainant employee and targeting a Complainant vendor with a phishing scheme. When registering the Domain Name, the Respondent used a privacy service and used the name of the impersonated employee as the name of the underlying registrant. Prior to and since the filing of the Complaint, the Domain Name has not resolved to an active web site.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy to transfer the Domain Name, which it requested.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the Respondent sent to a Complainant vendor an email using the Domain Name, fraudulently impersonating a real employee of the Complainant, in which the Respondent initiated a false freight-transportation inquiry, and that the Complainant has made a prima facie showing that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name, shifting the burden of production to the Respondent.

B. Respondent

The Center received an email communication on January 21, 2026, that appears, on its face, to be from the impersonated Complainant employee at his email address with the Complainant. The Panel is unable to determine whether this email is from the impersonated employee or is a spoofed email communication from the Respondent, which the Panel has found had previously impersonated the employee when the Respondent registered the Domain Name. In any event, this email does not address any allegations in the Amended Complaint, or otherwise respond to the Amended Complaint.

6. Discussion and Findings

A complainant must prove three elements to obtain relief: (i) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the domain name; and (iii) the respondent registered and is using the domain name in bad faith. Policy, paragraph 4(a).

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel finds that the Complainant's registrations establish its trademark rights. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.2.1. The Domain Name incorporates the entire trademark, and the trademark is recognizable within the Domain Name, notwithstanding the addition of the elements "systems" and "medical" after the mark. The Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 1.8. Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has proven the first element: the Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which it has rights.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Respondent has not claimed the existence of any circumstance under the Policy, paragraph 4(c), that demonstrates that a respondent has rights to, or legitimate interests in, a domain name. The Complainant, on the other hand, has shown that it established its trademark rights before the Respondent registered the Domain Name; it has not authorized the Respondent to use its trademark; the record reflects no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the Domain Name or any similar name; and the Respondent has used the Domain Name to impersonate a Complainant employee in a phishing scheme, which is not a bona fide commercial use, a legitimate noncommercial use, or a fair use of the Domain Name. This constitutes prima facie a showing that the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name under the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(ii), shifting the burden of production on this second element to the Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence proving rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 2.1 and 2.13. The Respondent has not submitted any evidence to rebut the prima facie showing.

Additionally, the Respondent's name and email address do not resemble the Domain Name, corroborating that the Respondent is not commonly known by the Domain Name. In fact, and importantly, the Respondent falsely used the name of a Complainant employee when registering the Domain Name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.2. Not surprisingly, the Respondent failed to provide any evidence of an actual or a planned bona fide commercial use, a noncommercial use, or a fair use of the Domain Name, or even to respond to the Complaint. On the contrary, the evidence shows impersonation and an intended deceptive use for commercial gain. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 2.5 and 2.13.

Most importantly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has proven that the Respondent impersonated a Complainant employee in a phishing attempt to obtain freight transportation information from a Complainant vendor. Panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for impersonation to engage in phishing can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has proven the second element: the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that the Respondent deliberately chose a domain name whose only plausible purpose is for deceptive emails targeting the Complainant's business. The Respondent then promptly impersonated a Complainant employee in a phishing attempt directed to a Complainant vendor, which is per se a deceptive and illegitimate activity and a bad faith use of the Domain Name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 3.1.4, 3.2.1, and 3.4. These findings compel the Panel's conclusion that the Respondent (1) intentionally registered the Domain Name in bad faith to impersonate the Complainant and target the Complainant's business and (2) used it in bad faith to impersonate the Complainant and target a Complainant vendor for its own illegitimate commercial gain. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 3.1, 3.1.4, and 3.4. The Respondent's use of a privacy service and of the name of a Complainant employee as the registrant's name, and the Respondent's failure to submit a response to the Complaint, support the conclusion of bad faith registration and use. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 3.2.1, 3.6, and 4.3. Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has proven the third element: the Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

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 <variansystemsmedical.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/A. Justin Ourso III/

A. Justin Ourso III

Sole Panelist

Date: February 16, 2026