

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Endo Biologics Limited v. Knigavko Alexander Vladimirovich
Case No. D2026-0811

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Endo Biologics Limited, Ireland, represented by Cozen O'Connor, United States of America ("U.S." or "United States").

The Respondent is Knigavko Alexander Vladimirovich, Ukraine.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <xiaflex-peyronie.com> is registered with Hosting Ukraine LLC (ua.ukraine) (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 25, 2026. On February 26, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 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 (Unknown Registrant) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 2, 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 March 2, 2026.

On March 2, 2026, the Center informed the parties in Russian and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is Russian. On March 2, 2026, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceedings. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission.

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 in English and Russian of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 26, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 27, 2026.

The Center appointed Alissia Shchichka as the sole panelist in this matter on April 1, 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 biologic pharmaceutical company engaged in the development, manufacturing, and commercialization of medicines.

The Complainant states that it markets a United States Food and Drug Administration ("FDA") approved biologic product under the trademark XIAFLEX, used for the treatment of certain structural conditions through the breakdown of collagen. The product is prescribed as a nonsurgical treatment option for conditions including Dupuytren's contracture and Peyronie's disease.

The Complainant has provided evidence that it is the registered owner of numerous trademarks, including, but not limited to the following:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 3785074, registered on May 4, 2010, for the word mark XIAFLEX, in class 5;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 3886633, registered on December 7, 2010, for the semi figurative trademark XIAFLEX, in classes 5, 16, and 44;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 3862018, registered on October 12, 2010, for the figurative trademark XIAFLEX COLLAGENASE CLOSTRIDIUM HISTOLYTICUM, in class 5.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 26, 2026.

The disputed domain name currently resolves to an inactive website. However, at the time of the filing of the Complaint, it resolved to a website titled "Peyronie's Disease Center". According to the screenshot provided by the Center which was saved on the day of the Notification of the Complaint, the website appeared to promote an alternative treatment protocol for Peyronie's disease, presented as a more advanced and comprehensive option compared to the Complainant's XIAFLEX products.

The Respondent, according to the disclosed Whols information for the disputed domain name, is located in Ukraine.

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 asserts that its XIAFLEX trademark is distinctive and well known.

According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's XIAFLEX trademark, as it incorporates the entire trademark together with the descriptive term "peyronie". According to the Complainant, the addition of this term does not avoid confusing similarity and, on the contrary, reinforces the association with the Complainant and its products used to treat Peyronie's disease.

The Complainant also asserts that the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com” should be disregarded under the first element as it is a standard registration requirement.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because: (1) the Respondent is not affiliated with, licensed by, or otherwise authorized to use the Complainant’s XIAFLEX trademarks in connection with the disputed domain name; (2) there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name; and (3) the disputed domain name has not been used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, as it resolves to a webpage with no substantive content. The Complainant also notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name anonymously through a privacy service.

Finally, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. In particular, the Complainant submits that (1) its XIAFLEX trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain name by more than a decade, and the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant’s rights; (2) the composition of the disputed domain name, combining the XIAFLEX trademark with the descriptive term “peyronie”, further shows that the Respondent intended to attract users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or location or of a product or service on its website or location; and (3) the passive holding of the disputed domain name, combined with the Respondent’s concealment of identity supports a finding of bad faith.

Accordingly, the Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Issues

A. Location of the Respondent

The Panel notes that the information provided by the Registrar shows that the Respondent is located in Ukraine. Ukraine is currently subject to an international conflict at the date of this Complaint and this Decision. The Panel is required to consider under paragraph 10 of the Rules whether the proceedings should continue.

Under paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel is required to ensure that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case, and that the administrative proceedings take place with due expedition.

The Panel is of the view that the proceedings should continue, having considered all the circumstances of the case. The Panel notes the following factors:

The record shows that the Notification of Complaint was sent by email to the Respondent at the email address disclosed by the Registrar. No bounce-back messages suggesting the abovementioned email was not delivered to the Respondent’s email address disclosed by the Registrar were received by the Center after commencement of the proceedings.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name was registered on January 26, 2026, several years after the commencement of the international conflict. This indicates that, at the time of registration, the Respondent was able to provide the Registrar with a functioning address despite the conflict, and therefore appears capable of controlling both the disputed domain name and the related content. Moreover, given that

the Respondent evidently has Internet access, it is reasonable to conclude that the Respondent would have received at least electronic notice of this proceeding.

Also as noted later in this Decision, the Panel has no serious doubt (albeit in the absence of any Response) that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith with knowledge of the Complainant and with the intention of unfairly targeting the Complainant's trademark and goodwill.

The Panel concludes that the Parties have been given a fair opportunity to present their case. In order that the administration of proceedings takes place with due expedition, the Panel proceeds to a Decision accordingly.

B. Language of the Proceedings

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Russian. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceedings shall be the language of the registration agreement.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see [WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions \("WIPO Overview 3.1"\)](#), section 4.5.1).

The Complaint was filed in English, and the Complainant requested that English be adopted as the language of the proceeding. The Complainant submits that translating the Complaint into Russian would be unnecessary and burdensome.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent is capable of understanding English. In particular, the disputed domain name resolved to a website that allowed users to select English as a display language and appeared to target English-speaking users. The Complainant submits that this demonstrates that the Respondent has sufficient familiarity with the English language.

The Center transmitted all communications to the Respondent in both English and Russian, and invited the Respondent to comment on the language of the proceedings. The Respondent, however, did not submit any comments on the language of the proceedings or react to the proceedings in any way.

Having considered all relevant circumstances, including the absence of any objection, and the need to avoid undue delay or expenses by translating all materials for the Complainant, the Panel finds it appropriate to exercise its discretion under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules. The Panel concludes that conducting the proceedings in English is fair, reasonable, and efficient and that the Respondent will not be disadvantaged by this decision. Accordingly, the Panel determines that the language of the proceedings shall be English.

6.2. Substantive Issues

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 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 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.

Although the addition of other elements, namely a hyphen and the term “peyronie”, 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 Complainant has confirmed that the Respondent is neither affiliated with the Complainant, nor otherwise authorized or licensed to use the XIAFLEX trademark or to seek registration of any domain name incorporating the trademark. The Respondent is also not known to be associated with the XIAFLEX trademark, and there is no evidence showing that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.3. On the contrary, the available record indicates that the Respondent operated under a different name, namely “Advances Andrology Peyronie’s Disease Center by Aleksandr Knigavko”, which is unrelated to the Complainant.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name previously resolved to a website promoting treatment for Peyronie’s disease under the supervision of “Professor Aleksandr Knigavko”, including references to clinics in various jurisdictions and offering online consultations. The website advertised an “author’s protocol” presented as an alternative to XIAFLEX, involving collagenase-based treatments combined with PRP, stem cells, exosomes, biostimulation, rehabilitation, and microsurgery. The website content does not demonstrate any legitimate informational purpose, but rather promotes competing medical treatments. Accordingly, in the Panel’s view, it does not constitute a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.4.

Furthermore, the use of the Complainant’s XIAFLEX trademark in the disputed domain name, combined with the descriptive term “peyronie”, carry a risk of implied affiliation or endorsement and cannot constitute fair use suggests affiliation or endorsement. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Further, the Panel finds no actual connection between the Complainant's trademark and the Respondent's website content. Rather, the disputed domain name was used to promote the Respondent's own treatment methodology, which constitutes an alternative to, and competes with, the Complainant's product. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.2. Such commercial use is not consistent with a bona fide offering of goods and services.

The Panel also considers that the Respondent is seeking commercial gain by using the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain name to attract Internet users and divert them to its website offering competing services, thereby seeking to capitalize on the Complainant's reputation. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.3. Such conduct cannot constitute legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

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.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and the Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

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.

In the present case, the Panel observes that the Complainant's XIAFLEX trademarks predate the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's trademark together with the descriptive term "peyronie", which directly refers to a condition treated by the Complainant's product. In light of these circumstances, and considering the content of the website to which the disputed domain name previously resolved, the Panel finds that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's business and trademarks at the time of registering the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

In the Panel's view, the Respondent's use of the Complainant's XIAFLEX trademark in the disputed domain name, in combination with its prior use in connection with a website promoting treatment for "Peyronie's Disease Center" and advertising alternative treatments and products to XIAFLEX, demonstrates that the Respondent deliberately sought to capitalize on the Complainant's reputation and goodwill. The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website, for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that, in the circumstances of this case, the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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 <xiaflex-peyronie.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Alissia Shchichka/

Alissia Shchichka

Sole Panelist

Date: April 15, 2026