

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Neurocrine Biosciences, Inc. v. 任艺伟 (Yi Wei Ren), Qingqing Yu, Yiwei Ren, Yiwei

Case No. D2026-1767

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is 任艺伟 (Yi Wei Ren), China, Qingqing Yu, China, and Yiwei Ren, Yiwei, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <neurocrine.me> is registered with West263 International Limited, <neurocrine.online> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC, and <neurocrine.site> is registered with West263 Atak Domain Hosting Internet ve Bilgi Teknolojileri Limited Sirketi d/b/a Atak Teknoloji (the "Registrars").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 24, 2026. On April 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On April 27 and April 28, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by emails to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY), DOMAINS BY PROXY, LLC and APINAME LTD) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 28, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint in English on April 30, 2026.

On April 28, 2026, the Center informed the parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name <neurocrine.me> is Chinese. On April 30, 2026, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondents 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 Respondents in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 24, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on June 1, 2026.

The Center appointed Deanna Wong Wai Man as the sole panelist in this matter on June 8, 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 founded in 1992. It focuses on the discovery, development, and commercialization of treatments for neurological, neuroendocrine, and endocrine-related disorders. The Complainant has used the trademark NEUROCRINE in connection with its business for more than three decades and owns and operates the domain name <neurocrine.com>, together with a number of other domain names incorporating its NEUROCRINE mark.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for the mark NEUROCRINE in various jurisdictions. These include, among others:

- International Trademark Registration No. 1468022 for NEUROCRINE, registered on April 12, 2019; and
- United States Patent and Trademark Office Registration No. 5762521 for NEUROCRINE, registered on May 28, 2019.

The disputed domain names <neurocrine.me>, <neurocrine.site>, and <neurocrine.online> were registered on September 3, 2025, September 22, 2025, and November 4, 2025, respectively. The evidence shows that the disputed domain names have not been used in connection with any active websites. Rather, each disputed domain name has been offered for sale through GoDaddy for USD 1,450.

Following the Center’s request for registrar verification, the underlying registrant information disclosed that the disputed domain names were registered in the names of “Yi Wei Ren”, “Yiwei Ren”, and “Qingqing Yu”, all with addresses in the same province, China.

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 names.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are identical to its NEUROCRINE trademark, as each incorporates the mark in its entirety, with the only difference being the applicable generic or country code Top-Level Domain (“gTLD” or “ccTLD”), namely “.online”, “.site”, and “.me”, which should be disregarded for the purposes of the first element under the Policy. The Complainant further submits that it has established rights in the NEUROCRINE mark through its longstanding use and trademark registrations in multiple jurisdictions.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. According to the Complainant, it has neither authorized nor otherwise permitted the Respondents to use its NEUROCRINE trademark or to register domain names incorporating the mark. The Complainant submits that the Respondents are not commonly known by the disputed domain names and have not used them in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services or any legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Instead, the disputed domain names have been offered for sale at a price substantially exceeding the likely out-of-pocket registration costs.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Complainant submits that its NEUROCRINE mark had been used and registered for many years prior to the registration of the disputed domain names and is well known in the pharmaceutical industry, such that the Respondents could not credibly have been unaware of the Complainant's rights. The Complainant further relies on the fact that the disputed domain names are identical to its trademark, have been offered for sale, have not been put to any active use, and that the disclosed registrants have been respondents in numerous previous UDRP proceedings involving third-party trademarks.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 First Preliminary Issue: Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name <neurocrine.me> is Chinese. 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 proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint and amended Complaint were filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that the disputed domain names comprise an English-language term entirely corresponding to the Complainant's trademark; the disputed domain names resolve to English-language domain name sales pages displaying prices in United States dollars; and the disclosed registrants have previously participated in numerous UDRP proceedings that were conducted in English.

The Respondents did not make any specific submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

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).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2 Second Preliminary Issue: Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the underlying registrant information disclosed by the Registrars reveals significant overlaps between the registrants of the disputed domain names. In particular, two of the disputed domain names are registered in the name of "Yi Wei Ren"/"Yiwei Ren", while all three registrants are located in the same province, China, with closely corresponding addresses in Huai'an. The disputed domain names were registered within a relatively short period between September and November 2025, are each identical to the Complainant's NEUROCRINE mark apart from the applicable Top-Level Domain thereby exposing a pattern, have been used in the same manner by being offered for sale through GoDaddy at the identical price of USD 1,450, and share the same passive technical configuration. The Panel further notes that the disclosed registrants have each been named as respondents in previous UDRP proceedings involving third-party trademarks, including *Teva Respiratory, LLC v. Qingqing Yu*, WIPO Case No. [DCO2025-0066](#), and *Trioworld Industrier AB v. 任艺伟 (Yi Wei Ren)*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1974](#). In the absence of any Response or other evidence to the contrary, the Panel considers that these, cumulative circumstances support a finding, on the balance of probabilities, that the disputed domain names are subject to common ownership or control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

6.3 Findings on the Merits

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 incorporated within the disputed domain names, with no further additions. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Complainant states that it has not licensed, authorized or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its NEUROCRINE trademark or to register any domain name incorporating that mark. There is no evidence that the Respondent is affiliated with the Complainant in any way, or that it has been commonly known by the disputed domain names within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. Additionally, there is no evidence that the Respondents have used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, the evidence shows that the disputed domain names have only been passively held and are each offered for sale for USD 1,450. Such use does not give rise to rights or legitimate interests under the Policy.

Finally, the Panel also notes that each disputed domain name consists solely of the Complainant’s NEUROCRINE trademark together with the applicable Top-Level Domain. In this regard, the Panel considers that the disputed domain names also carry a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. The composition of the disputed domain names indeed falsely suggests sponsorship, endorsement, or authorization by the Complainant and does not support any finding of rights or legitimate interests on the part of the Respondent. See section 2.5.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

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 notes that the disputed domain names are all identical to the Complainant’s NEUROCRINE trademark, differing only by the applicable Top-Level Domains. The Panel further notes that previous panel decisions under the Policy recognized the Complainant’s NEUROCRINE trademark as a well-known trademark, e.g. in *Neurocrine Biosciences, Inc. v. Jonen Boteda*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-1128](#), and the Panel agrees with that assessment in light of the evidence concerning the Complainant’s longstanding use and trademark registrations. The Panel therefore infers that, in registering the disputed domain names, there is a presumption that the Respondent deliberately targeted the Complainant’s well-known trademark. The Panel further notes that the Complainant’s trademark registrations predate the registration of the disputed domain names by several years and a simple Internet or trademark search would have shown those trademarks at the time of registration of the disputed domain names. In the absence of any plausible explanation from the Respondent, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew, or at least should have known, of the Complainant’s trademark rights at the time of registration. This conclusion is reinforced by the fact that the disputed domain names have not been used for any bona fide purpose but have instead been offered for sale for USD 1,450 each. In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names were registered in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The Panel notes that each of the disputed domain names has been offered for sale for USD 1,450. There is no evidence that the Respondent has made any bona fide use of the disputed domain names or have used them for any purpose other than offering them for sale. Given that the disputed domain names are identical to the Complainant's well-known trademark, and absent any explanation from the Respondent, the Panel finds that the Respondent's conduct is consistent with an intention to obtain valuable consideration likely to be in excess of their documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain names. In the circumstances of this case, the Panel considers that such conduct constitutes evidence of registration and use in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

Additionally, the Panel also notes that the Respondent has previously been involved in UDRP proceedings involving domain names that had been registered in bad faith, including *Teva Respiratory, LLC v. Qingqing Yu*, WIPO Case No. [DCO2025-0066](#), and *Trioworld Industrier AB v. 任艺伟 (Yi Wei Ren)*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1974](#). These prior decisions reinforce the pattern of bad-faith registrations evidenced by the evidence provided in the present proceeding.

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 names <neurocrine.me>, <neurocrine.online>, and <neurocrine.site> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Deanna Wong Wai Man/

Deanna Wong Wai Man

Sole Panelist

Date: June 22, 2026