

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Neurocrine Biosciences, Inc. v. Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC
Case No. D2026-0268

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Neurocrine Biosciences, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Fross Zelnick Lehrman & Zissu, PC, United States.

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

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <neurocrinesso.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 21, 2026. On January 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 23, 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 27, 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 28, 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 29, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 18, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on February 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Miguel B. O'Farrell as the sole panelist in this matter on March 5, 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 pharmaceutical company that currently employs over 1,900 people. It focuses on discovering and developing pharmaceuticals for the treatment of various diseases and disorders. The Complainant has been dedicated to discovering and developing medical treatments under the name NEUROCRINE since it was founded in 1992. Its portfolio includes treatments for tardive dyskinesia, chorea associated with Huntington's disease, and congenital adrenal hyperplasia.

The Complainant has obtained numerous trademark registrations for its NEUROCRINE mark in Europe, the United States, and in other jurisdictions around the world prior to the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name, including the following:

United States Trademark Registration No. 5762521 NEUROCRINE, registered on May 28, 2019, in class 5;

United States Trademark Registration No. 5762522 NEUROCRINE, registered on May 29, 2019 in class 42; and

International Trademark Registration No. 1468022 NEUROCRINE, registered on April 12, 2019, in classes 5 and 42.

The Complaint includes full listings of NEUROCRINE trademark registrations owned by the Complainant in many jurisdictions around the world.

In addition, the Complainant owns many domain names that include the term "neurocrine".

The disputed domain name was registered on December 29, 2025. The Complainant claims (without providing evidence) that the disputed domain name previously resolved to a login webpage which purportedly emulated the Complainant's webpage until it was terminated shortly after the Complainant made a complaint to the Registrar on January 6, 2026. The disputed domain name currently does not resolve to an active website.

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.

In essence, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's NEUROCRINE marks; the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain names in bad faith.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the Respondent appears to have registered the disputed domain name as part of a phishing scheme or to otherwise perpetrate a fraud. When it first came to the Complainant's attention, the website included a login screen phishing for visitors' login credentials for their accounts with Okta, an identity management company. Indeed, the title of the website that previously appeared at the disputed domain name was "Okta – Login".

Three reported users of the Complainant received phone calls from a spoofed number matching the Complainant's external number posted at its website. The impersonators directed the users to access the Respondent's website that mimicked the Complainant's Single Sign on website, to harvest credentials for the Complainant's company, with one user doing so. Those credentials were then used to access the Complainant's systems without consent and attempted further access until they were blocked.

The Complainant requests a 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.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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.

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.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent was most likely aware of the Complainant's trademark NEUROCRINE when it registered the disputed domain name on December 29, 2025, many years after the Complainant widely registered and intensely used its trademark.

The Respondent, when registering the disputed domain name, targeted the Complainant and its trademark NEUROCRINE, with the intention to confuse Internet users and capitalize on the fame of the Complainant's trademark for its own benefit. The Panel notes that, although the Complainant has provided no evidence in support of its contention that the disputed domain name has been used to harvest users' credentials for accessing the Complainant's system, the added term "sso" in the disputed domain name could stand for "single sign-on" (an authentication scheme).

The fact that there is an absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no credible explanation for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name is also a significant factor that contributes to the finding that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith (as stated in section 3.2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#)).

The non-use of the disputed domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Noting the reputation of the Complainant's mark, the composition of the disputed domain name, and the Respondent's failure to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, the Panel finds that the non-use of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this case.

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 <neurocrinesso.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Miguel B. O'Farrell/

Miguel B. O'Farrell

Sole Panelist

Date: March 19, 2026