

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Haleon UK IP Limited v. Roger Directors, Roger Directors doo  
Case No. D2026-1894

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Haleon UK IP Limited, United Kingdom, represented by SafeNames Ltd., United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Roger Directors, Roger Directors doo, Serbia.

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

The disputed domain name <haleonhelp.info> 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 May 1, 2026. On May 1, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 1, 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 May 1, 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 May 6, 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 May 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Miguel B. O’Farrell as the sole panelist in this matter on June 11, 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, Haleon UK IP Limited, formerly GlaxoSmithKline Consumer Healthcare (UK) IP Limited, is a British multinational company established in July 2022 as part of a spin-off from GSK plc. GlaxoSmithKline Consumer Healthcare (UK) IP Limited changed its name to Haleon UK IP Limited on April 14, 2023.

The Complainant is the owner of various trademark registrations for HALEON in several jurisdictions worldwide, including the following.

International Trademark Registration No. 1674572 HALEON, registered on November 29, 2021, in classes 3, 5, 9, 10, 21, 29, 30, 32, 35, 36, 41, 42 and 44; and

United Kingdom Trademark Registration No UK00003726732 HALEON, registered on March 11, 2022, in classes 3, 5, 9, 10, 21, 29, 30, 32, 35, 36, 41, 42 and 44.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 22, 2025, and currently resolves to a website reading: "Launching Soon", "Contact Us", "Drop us a line!" with spaces to enter "name" and "email".

#### **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 trademark HALEON in which the Complainant has rights, that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, which was registered and is used in bad faith.

Healthcare consumers will be led to think that the webpage to which the disputed domain name resolves belongs to or is endorsed by the Complainant.

The Complainant requests the Panel to issue a decision ordering 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**

##### **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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[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 entirety of the mark is reproduced 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 terms here, “help” 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.

As it is generally acceptable, the Panel will disregard the general Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.info” from its confusing similarity test.

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 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.

The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent was most likely aware of the Complainant’s trademark HALEON when it registered the disputed domain name on October 22, 2025, many years after the Complainant widely registered and intensely used its trademark.

The Respondent, when registering the disputed domain name, targeted the Complainant and its trademark HALEON, with the intention to confuse Internet users and capitalize on the fame of the Complainant’s trademark for its own benefit.

The fact that there is an absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no credible explanation for the Respondent’s choice of the disputed domain name is also a significant factor that contributes to the finding that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith (as stated in section 3.2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#)).

The non-use of the disputed domain name (including a blank or “coming soon” page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panelists have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. Noting the reputation of the Complainant’s mark, the composition of the disputed domain name, and the Respondent’s failure to

submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, the Panel finds that the non-use of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this case.

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 <haleonhelp.info> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Miguel B. O'Farrell/*

**Miguel B. O'Farrell**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 25, 2026