

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Norgine Limited v. Judith Lisa

Case No. D2026-0284

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Norgine Limited, United Kingdom, represented internally.

The Respondent is Judith Lisa, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <norgineuk.com> is registered with IONOS SE (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 23, 2026. On January 26, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 27, 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 Adam Samuel as the sole panelist in this matter on February 27, 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 part of a specialist pharmaceutical goods and services group of companies based predominantly in Europe. The Complainant owns a United Kingdom trademark no UK00000609225 for NORGINE registered on September 26, 1939. The Complainant markets its products and services through a number of domain names, including <norgine.com>, registered on October 7, 1997.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 13, 2026. It does not currently resolve to an active website. The Complainant asserts that in the past it resolved to a website that impersonated the Complainant.

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 incorporates the Complainant's trademark which has no secondary meaning in the English language. The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" should be disregarded. Otherwise, the disputed domain name contains the acronym "uk" which is strongly associated with the Complainant.

The disputed domain name was historically used for a fake website which purported to be the website of the Complainant. The website to which the disputed domain name resolved displayed the Complainant's NORGINE mark on its webpages falsely presenting the Respondent as a leading pharmaceutical company and deliberately impersonating the Complainant Group's website. The website also displayed as the contact details the Complainant's registered business address.

This was plainly intended to deceive visitors into believing that the fraudulent website was operated or authorized by the Complainant Group. The website listed the email address of its owner as "[...]@norigineuk.com" which further reinforced the false impression of legitimacy. A specific page on the Respondent's website invited users to submit inquiries and apply for fictitious job vacancies and thereby give the Respondent their personal data. The Respondent has used the disputed domain name for unlawful phishing activities.

The Complainant has never authorised the Respondent to use the Complainant's trademark. Nor has any member of the Complainant's Group authorised the Respondent to use the NORGINE trademark in any domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied:

(i) the disputed 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 respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The disputed domain contains the Complainant's trademark, the acronym "uk" and the gTLD ".com".

The gTLD is irrelevant here as it is a standard registration requirement. See section 1.11.1 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)").

The insertion of two letters which are actually an acronym for the United Kingdom where the Complainant has a significant presence does not diminish the confusing similarity between the dispute domain name and the Complainant's trademark. See Section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#)

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Respondent is not called "norgine" or anything similar. There is no evidence that the Complainant has ever authorised the Respondent to use its trademarks, nor that the Respondent has made a bona fide offering or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. For these reasons, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has met this element. See section 2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Complainant's trademark is a word with no independent meaning. The uncontroverted evidence of a past website to which the disputed domain name resolved until recently suggests that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant. The website to which the disputed domain resolved presented itself as being the Complainant, describing the Complainant as pharmaceutical company. An annex to the Complaint shows that the Respondent was using the disputed domain name to obtain job applications and other messages which contained Internet users' personal data. The Respondent presents the Complainant's corporate address in the United Kingdom. On registering the disputed domain name, the Respondent knew about the Complainant and its business and wished to divert Internet users seeking the Complainant's United Kingdom website to its own in order to obtain personal data.

All this is evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith. There is no need to deal with the Complainant's other allegations.

For these reasons, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has met this element.

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 <norgineuk.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Adam Samuel/

Adam Samuel

Sole Panelist

Date: March 16, 2026