

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Heartflow, Inc. v. Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC  
Case No. D2026-1346

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Heartflow, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by O’Melveny & Myers, LLP, United States.

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

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

The disputed domain name <heartflowai.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 March 28, 2026. On March 30, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 30, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 7, 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 April 11, 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 April 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 3, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Ganna Prokhorova as the sole panelist in this matter on May 18, 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 provider of artificial intelligence-driven medical technology specializing in the assessment and management of coronary artery disease (“CAD”). Its flagship product, Heartflow One, delivers integrated insights to help prevent, diagnose and treat CAD. Heartflow One is currently deployed at more than 88 healthcare centers across the United Kingdom. The Complainant’s product has been used to treat over half a million patients in over 1,600 health care institutions.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations incorporating the mark HEARTFLOW, including, inter alia:

- United States trademark registration HEARTFLOW (word), No. 4641437, registered on November 18, 2014, in classes 9 and 42;
- European Union trademark registration HEARTFLOW (word), No. 009749482, registered on July 22, 2011, in classes 9, 10 and 42; and
- United Kingdom trademark registration HEARTFLOW (word), UK00909749482, registered on July 22, 2011, in classes 9, 10 and 42.

The Complainant operates the official domain name <heartflow.com>, owned by the Complainant since 2010.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 23, 2025. At the time of the Complaint, the disputed domain name used to resolve to a website displaying content related to heart health, featuring a “.health” symbol and including an offer for sale of the disputed domain name. The website content that existed as of March 27, 2026, was replaced with a page with pay-per-click (“PPC”) links highlighting search topics related to “Heartflow Ai”, including “Heartflow Ai Free”, “Heartflow Ai Generator”, “Heartflow Ai Reviews”, “Heartflow Ai Voice”, “Heartflow Ai Download”, and “Heartflow Ai App”, displaying the notice “This domain has expired. If you owned this name, contact your registration provider for assistance. To identify your provider, CLICK HERE”. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to the same page.

#### 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:

(1) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark, since it incorporates the HEARTFLOW mark and the addition of the descriptive term “ai” and the “.com” extension does not prevent confusion. The Complainant’s product is promoted as driven by AI technology, therefore the Respondent’s inclusion of the term “ai” increases confusing similarity;

(2) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name years after the Complainant established and widely used the HEARTFLOW trademark. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, has no license or authorization to use the HEARTFLOW mark, and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The website content for the disputed domain name that previously existed is replaced with a generic, parked page indicating that the domain is expired and highlighting search topics related to “Heartflow Ai”, including “Heartflow Ai Free”, “Heartflow Ai Generator”, “Heartflow Ai Reviews”, “Heartflow Ai Voice”, “Heartflow Ai Download”, and “Heartflow Ai App”. Such conduct negates any claim of legitimate interest; and

(3) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant's well-known HEARTFLOW trademark and is intentionally attempting to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement, where such conduct falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy and justifies transfer of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has engaged in similar infringing conduct in prior proceedings, further supporting a finding of bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules provides that the Panel is to decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, the Rules, and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

The onus is on the Complainant to make out its case and it is apparent, both from the terms of the Policy and the decisions of past UDRP panels, that the Complainant must show that all three elements set out in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been established before any order can be made to transfer the disputed domain name. In UDRP cases, the standard of proof is the balance of probabilities.

To succeed in a UDRP complaint, the Complainant has to demonstrate that all the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, namely:

- (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.

The Respondent was given proper notice of the Complaint and had the opportunity to respond. Under paragraph 5(a) of the Rules, the Respondent was required to submit its response within 20 days of commencement of the proceeding. The Respondent failed to do so.

Pursuant to paragraph 5(f) of the Rules, in the event of such a default, the Panel shall proceed to a decision based on the Complaint. However, the Respondent's default does not mean that the Complainant automatically prevails; the Complainant continues to bear the burden of proof on each element. The Panel may draw appropriate inferences from the Respondent's silence, and, where appropriate, accept as true the reasonable allegations in the Complaint that are not contradicted by evidence.

The Panel has reviewed the entire case file and the evidence provided. The Panel is also guided, where pertinent, by the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), which reflects consensus positions of UDRP panels on many common issues. The Panel will make reference to these consensus views in the analysis below as applicable.

### **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 mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Panel finds that the Complainant has shown rights in respect of its HEARTFLOW mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the Complainant's mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's HEARTFLOW mark in its entirety, with the only differences being the addition of the term "ai". In accordance with [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8, addition of other terms, whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise, would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element, as the Complainant's mark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The Panel further notes that the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is required only for technical reasons and is generally ignored for the purposes of comparison of the Complainant's mark to the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark and that the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

## **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 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 evidence before the Panel shows that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in a manner that targets and incorporates the Complainant's HEARTFLOW trademark, including by reproducing it in its entirety within the disputed domain name and in associated website content. At the time relevant to the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website containing content related to heart health and prominently referencing a ".health" designation, together with an offer to sell the disputed domain name. The Panel notes that such use is not supported by any authorization from the Complainant and creates a risk of implied affiliation.

Furthermore, the Complainant has developed solutions that are based on its AI-powered 3D modeling of the heart to generate data-driven insights, the Respondent's inclusion of the term "ai" in the disputed domain name does nothing to diminish, and, if anything, may actually increase, the risk of affiliation between the Complainant's HEARTFLOW trademark and the disputed domain name.

The evidence shows that as of the time of this Decision the disputed domain name resolves to a parked webpage with PPC links and is therefore not used for any genuine business purpose. Such parking of the disputed domain name does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy in the circumstances of this case. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.9.

The Panel further notes that the Complainant has established trademark rights in HEARTFLOW and has confirmed that it has no relationship with the Respondent. The Respondent has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the Complainant's trademark. There is also no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

In light of the Respondent's failure to participate in the proceedings, the absence of any credible evidence of rights or legitimate interests, and the clear intent to capitalize on the goodwill of the Complainant's trademark, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Complainant has satisfied the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

### **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 finds that the Respondent both registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith under paragraph 4(b) of the Policy.

The Complainant operates globally under the distinctive HEARTFLOW trademark and offers AI-driven medical technology solutions for CAD. The Complainant is a provider of AI-driven medical technology for CAD and introduced substantial evidence to bolster its claim that it is well-known worldwide. The Complainant has also operated the domain name <heartflow.com> since 2010.

Given the international reputation of the Complainant and the coined nature of the HEARTFLOW mark, the Panel finds it implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration. The disputed domain name incorporates the HEARTFLOW trademark in its entirety, adding only the non-distinctive term "ai", a composition which strongly supports a finding of deliberate targeting in accordance with section 3.2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

The disputed domain name was registered on March 23, 2025, many years after the Complainant's rights in the trademark HEARTFLOW were established. Considering the reputation of the Complainant's mark, the composition of the disputed domain name, and the Respondent's failure to submit any Response, the Panel finds that the use of the disputed domain name in this case supports, rather than negates, a finding of bad faith.

The Panel further finds that the Respondent's conduct falls within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. By registering the disputed domain name that wholly incorporates the Complainant's well-known HEARTFLOW trademark together with the term "ai", the Respondent has created a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the disputed domain name. Such composition inherently suggests an association with the Complainant and constitutes an intentional attempt to exploit the goodwill of the Complainant's trademark.

The Respondent has provided no explanation for its choice of the disputed domain name, is not commonly known by it, and has not been authorized by the Complainant to use its trademark. The absence of any Response further reinforces the Panel's inference of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.3.

The Panel notes that the Respondent has engaged in similar infringing conduct in prior proceedings, including in *Sanofi v. Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-4563](#), where the complainant operated in the pharmaceutical and healthcare sector, comparable to the Complainant's field of activity in the present case. This supports a finding of a pattern of conduct targeting trademarks within a similar area of commerce. Panels may infer bad faith where a Respondent engages in multiple abusive domain name registrations, including across different trademark owners, particularly where such conduct targets marks in a common industry, aimed at similar consumers or sectors. In the present case, the Respondent's prior involvement in UDRP proceedings, combined with the registration of the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant's HEARTFLOW trademark, demonstrates a pattern of conduct consistent with bad faith registration and use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.1.2 and 3.2.1.

Having regard to the totality of the circumstances, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. Accordingly, 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 <heartflowai.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Ganna Prokhorova/*

**Ganna Prokhorova**

Sole Panelist

Date: May 27, 2026