

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Chiesi Farmaceutici S.p.A. v. Sok Chenda, Click Group
Case No. D2026-1105

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Chiesi Farmaceutici S.p.A., Italy, represented by Studio Barbero S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is Sok Chenda, Click Group, Cambodia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <chiesiinalers.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 13, 2026. On March 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 16, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 18, 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 amendment to the Complaint on March 19, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 March 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Dennis A. Foster as the sole panelist in this matter on April 17, 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 multinational bio-pharmaceutical company based in Parma, Italy. It was founded in Italy in 1935, and now has research, manufacturing and sales facilities around the world. The Complainant currently employs over 7,000 employees, and in 2024 had revenue of EUR 3.4 billion. The Complainant's primary website is at the domain name <chiesi.com> which was registered in 2009.

The Complainant is the owner of, inter alia, the following trademark registrations:

- Italian Trademark Registration No. 202020000030091 for CHIESI (word mark), registered on September 8, 2020, in classes 1, 10, and 24 for inter alia industrial chemicals, pharmaceutical chemicals, orthopedic products and implants, scientific and biological research.
- International Trademark Registration No. 1542645 for CHIESI (word mark), registered on April 24, 2020, in classes 1, 5, 10, and 42, designating various jurisdictions.
- International Trademark Registration No. 1052814 for CHIESI (figurative mark), registered on August 2, 2010, in classes 5 and 10, designating various jurisdictions.

The Respondent is apparently an individual and an entity in Cambodia who registered the disputed domain name on February 13, 2024. The Respondent initially used the website at the disputed domain name to purport to be the Complainant's Pakistani affiliate by displaying its name and contact information, and to offer information about a pharmaceutical product manufactured by Complainant. The Respondent now uses the website to offer online betting and gambling in Indonesian. The Complainant sent the Respondent cease-and-desist letters on three occasions in December of 2025, but the Respondent never replied.

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 confusingly similar to the Complainant's registered trademark CHIESI because the entire trademark is included within the disputed domain name. The addition of generic or descriptive terms to the Complainant's trademark does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the Policy. The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is a standard domain name registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

- The Respondent is neither a licensee nor an authorized agent of the Complainant. Therefore, no bona fide use or legitimate rights or interests can be claimed. There is no evidence that the Respondent was commonly known by the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name was originally resolved to a website, displaying the Complainant's CHIESI trademark and logo and purporting to offer information about the Complainant's inhaler products which are offered through one of the Complainant's affiliated companies in Pakistan, which amounts to impersonation. The Respondent subsequently redirected Internet users from the disputed domain name to a gambling website targeting Indonesia where such activity is illegal.

- The Complainant's trademark is well known, particularly in the pharmaceutical industry. The Complainant has been mentioned in trade publications such as Fortune magazine. Moreover, the Respondent initially used the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant's Pakistani subsidiary. Therefore, the Respondent should have been aware of the Complainant when it registered the disputed domain name. The Respondent's subsequent redirection of Internet users from the website at the disputed domain name to a gambling website targeting Indonesia where gambling is illegal is also proof of bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has violated paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy by registering a domain name confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark and using it for commercial gain.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Pursuant to Policy paragraphs 4(a)(i), (ii), and (iii), the Panel may render a decision for the Complainant and grant a transfer of the disputed domain name, if the Complainant shows that:

- The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant's first burden of proof under Policy paragraph 4(a)(i) is to show that it has trademark rights. To this end, the Complainant exhibited a number of its registered CHIESI trademarks as referenced in the section above. The Panel finds this satisfies the requirement that the Complainant has trademark rights for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.2.1.

Next, the Panel observes that the entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name with the addition of the term "inhalers". The Panel finds this does not prevent the confusing similarity between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. And as the Complainant points out, the gTLD ".com" is not taken into consideration in this analysis because it is viewed as a standard registration requirement. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel thus finds that the Complainant has carried its burden of proof under Policy paragraph 4(a)(i) to show that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The next burden of proof for the Complainant per Policy paragraph 4(a)(ii) is to show that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Policy decisions' consensus is that the Complainant initially needs to make out a prima facie case (because of the difficulty of proving a negative), and then the burden of production shifts to the Respondent, although the overall burden of proof remains the responsibility of the Complainant.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

The Complainant contends that it has not authorized or licensed the Respondent to use its trademark in the disputed domain name. The Complainant also has shown that the Respondent has previously used the disputed domain name to purport to offer, without authorization, information on the Complainant's inhaler products in Pakistan, and then to offer gambling services in Indonesia. The Panel therefore finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case per the Policy.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

The Respondent is in default in these proceedings, and thus has not come forward to attempt to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case. Nonetheless, the Panel will review the case record to see whether the Respondent might have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name per Policy paragraphs 4(c)(i), (ii), or (iii).

Under Policy paragraph 4(c)(i), the Respondent must show that, before being notified of the Complaint, the Respondent was using, or making preparations to use, the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services. But the Respondent herein initially pretended to be the Complainant offering the Complainant's goods in Pakistan, and subsequently began using the website at the disputed domain name to offer online gambling to residents of Indonesia where online gambling appears to be illegal. These are not bona fide offerings of goods or services under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1. (See *Zambon S.p.A. v. affiliate sagor*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-5430](#) where the Respondent impersonated the Complainant and purported to offer the Complainant's pharmaceutical products: the panel found this was not a bona fide offering of goods. See also *Herr Foods Inc. v. Virken irawan*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-0810](#) (the "Herr Foods case") where the panel found gambling services of the kind offered through the respondent's website in Indonesia appeared to be illegal, and not a bona fide offering of goods or services.)

As the Complainant has contended, it nowhere appears in the record that the Respondent has been commonly known as the disputed domain name per Policy paragraph 4(c)(ii). As for the Policy paragraph 4 (c)(iii), it is evident from the record that the Respondent's intentions are primarily to obtain financial gain by misleadingly diverting consumers, rather than to make any fair use or noncommercial use of the disputed domain name.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety with the addition of "inhalers" indicating products related to the Complainant's field of commerce carries a risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

The Panel finds, then, that the Complainant has carried its burden of proof under Policy paragraph 4(a)(ii) to show that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Policy paragraph 4(b) sets out four non-exclusive grounds on which a respondent may be found to have registered and to be using a disputed domain name in bad faith. In this regard, the Panel can readily see that the Respondent's conduct falls under Policy paragraph 4(b)(iv) because the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name that is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark in pursuit of financial gain. As the Complainant points out, the Respondent was familiar with the Complainant and its mark because the Complainant is well known in its pharmaceutical field and the disputed domain name includes an additional term closely related to the Complainant's products, and because the Respondent began to purport to offer information on the Complainant's pharmaceutical products on the website.

Nor is this all. The Respondent later began to use the website at the disputed domain name to offer online gambling in Indonesia where online gambling appears to be illegal. This is per se bad faith registration and use per the pertinent Policy decisions' consensus. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. (See *Herr Foods* case above).

Concluding the foregoing discussion, the Panel finds the Complainant has carried its burden of proof under Policy paragraph 4(a)(iii) to show that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

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

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 <chiesiinhalers.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Dennis A. Foster/

Dennis A. Foster

Sole Panelist

Date: April 30, 2026