

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Modernatx, Inc. v. Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC  
Case No. D2026-0111

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Modernatx, Inc., United States of America (“USA”), represented by Modernatx, Inc., USA.

The Respondent is Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC, Saint Kitts and Nevis.

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

The disputed domain name <modernasso.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 12, 2026. On January 12, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 13, 2026, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 14, 2026, 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 15, 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 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 January 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 10, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Dr. Clive N.A. Trotman as the sole panelist in this matter on March 2, 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 biotechnology company involved in the development of advanced drugs and vaccines, including vaccines based on messenger RNA (mRNA) for the indirect stimulation of immunity. Another successful vaccine developed by the Complainant protects the elderly from respiratory syncytial virus (RSV).

The Complainant is a company of considerable scale with manufacturing facilities in the USA, the United Kingdom, Canada and Australia. Net product sales for vaccines reported by the Complainant amounted to about USD 3.1 billion in 2024.

The Complainant is the owner of more than 100 trademarks, of which the following are representative for the purposes of the present proceeding:

MODERNA, United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”), registered on December 23, 2014, registration number 4659803, in classes 1 and 5;

MODERNA, USPTO, registered on September 15, 2015, registration number 4811834, in class 42;

MODERNA, stylized, USPTO, registered on August 21, 2018, registration number 5543197, in classes 1, 5, and 42. This trademark is in red lettering above a blue dashed line and the registration document includes the statement: “The colors(s) blue and red is/are claimed as a feature of the mark” (“Complainant’s stylized trademark”)

The Complainant is also the registrant of the domain name <modernatx.com>, which it has held for about 15 years.

The Respondent has not provided any background information. The publicly available Whois record indicates that the registrant information has been redacted for privacy purposes. The Registrar has disclosed the underlying registrant’s name and address.

Njalla Okta LLC is a privacy service provider and is the registrant of the disputed domain name on behalf of another entity that has the use and controls the disputed domain name. That ultimate user is effectively the controlling Respondent but remains intentionally unidentified. The word “Respondent” will refer hereinafter to either Njalla Okta LLC or the unidentified ultimate user of the disputed domain name, as appropriate.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 1, 2026, and has resolved to a website (the “Respondent’s website”) displaying the Complainant’s stylized trademark. Employees of the Complainant have received telephone calls from an unknown individual falsely claiming to be a member of the Complainant’s cybersecurity or information technology (“IT”) team, directing them to the Respondent’s website. The Respondent’s website, incorporating the suffix “sso” after the Complainant’s trademark in the URL, appears to be designed to collect the login credentials of the Complainant’s employees by the deception of pretending to be the site where they should perform their single sign-on.

## **5. Parties' Contentions**

### **A. Complainant**

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

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety. The addition to the disputed domain name of the suffix "sso" should not prevent a finding of confusing similarity to the Complainant's trademark, and may create the deceptive impression that the Respondent's website is the Complainant's login website.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name has been used with the intention of fraud and therefore cannot have been used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Complainant states it has never authorized the Respondent to use the Complainant's trademark in any way. The Respondent has never been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant says that its trademark is well known internationally and was registered some 15 years before the disputed domain name. It is implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant at the time of registration of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant says that, in this instance, the Respondent has obscured its true identity in such a way as to indicate registration in bad faith. The disputed domain name is held behind a privacy shield, and behind that is a token registrant of record, which has in turn leased it to a hidden user, creating a "Russian doll" or multi-layered scenario.

The Complainant says the disputed domain name has been used to set up a website that impersonates the Complainant for the purpose of targeting the Complainant's employees through social engineering, deceiving them into disclosing login credentials and other sensitive information. The Respondent's website has been used in conjunction with fraudulent telephone calls to the Complainant's staff, falsely purporting to be from the Complainant's cybersecurity or IT team, inducing them to sign in to the Respondent's website. The Complainant submits that the use of a domain name for phishing or the impersonation of another party is, in itself, evidence of use in bad faith.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

### **B. Respondent**

The 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 Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "sso") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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 that 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 3.1](#), 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 name. 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 name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed phishing and impersonation) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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

### **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.

Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy reads as follows:

“by using the domain name, you [the Respondent] have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your web site or location or of a product or service on your web site or location.”

The Complainant has produced a screen capture of the Respondent's website, which is reminiscent in style of the standard login website available to subscribers to the Okta, Inc., single sign-on secure access service. The Complainant's name near the top of the page is an exact reproduction of the Complainant's stylized trademark, in the same font and the same red and blue registered colors, complete with the dashed blue underline having a fade-in appearance of increasing saturation from left to right. The screen capture in this instance is of a “Close support ticket” that suggests someone has already been induced to log in.

In the terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, the Respondent's website appears likely to be attributed to the Complainant by confusion; is likely to attract users through the display of the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain name, or to reassure them if they visit as the result of a fraudulent telephone call; and cannot reasonably have been invested in and set up by the Respondent without the intention of eventual commercial gain, amounting to registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The circumstances indicative of bad faith listed in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy are non-exhaustive and bad faith may be found otherwise. The inclusion of the suffix “sso”, meaning “single sign-on”, in the disputed domain name indicates a deliberate attempt to induce staff to disclose their login credentials to the Respondent. On the evidence, the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name and set up the corresponding website with the clear intention of targeting specifically the Complainant and with the intention of collecting the login credentials and passwords of the Complainant's employees, which may give access to the Complainant's computer systems and confidential information, or facilitate such access. The Panel finds the Respondent's deceptive conduct, in and of itself, to be sufficient for a finding that the disputed domain name has been registered and used in bad faith. Although holding a domain name registration through a privacy service may be legitimate and prudent, in this instance the inescapable conclusion is that the use of an additional layer of privacy, making the ultimate Respondent unreachable, is an aggravating factor supporting a finding of bad faith.

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 disputed domain name <modernasso.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Dr. Clive N.A. Trotman/*

**Dr. Clive N.A. Trotman**

Sole Panelist

Date: March 9, 2026