

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

IPSEN v. Edward Black  
Case No. D2026-2131

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is IPSEN, France, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Edward Black, United Kingdom.

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

The disputed domain name <ipsenbiopharm.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 May 18, 2026. On May 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 18, 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 DomainsByProxy.com) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 19, 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 21, 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 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 11, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Benoit Van Asbroeck as the sole panelist in this matter on June 16, 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, IPSEN, is a global pharmaceutical company focused on medical need, with products registered in 88 countries and over 5,000 employees worldwide.

The Complainant operates its main website at <ipsen.com>, a domain name created on May 7, 1997, registered with CSC Corporate Domains, Inc.

The Complainant holds several registered trademarks for IPSEN and IPSEN BIOPHARMACEUTICALS, including:

- United Kingdom Trade Mark No. UK00002146516 for IPSEN, filed on September 27, 1997 and registered on June 5, 1998;
- United States Registration No. 5171734 for IPSEN BIOPHARMACEUTICALS, filed on January 19, 2012 and registered on March 28, 2017.

The Complainant also holds several international trademark registrations, including International Registration No. 470005 for IPSEN, dated July 6, 1982, and International Registration No. 823036 for IPSEN, dated March 19, 2004, both active.

The disputed domain name <ipsenbiopharm.com> was registered on June 6, 2025, with registrar GoDaddy.com, LLC. At the time the initial Complaint was filed, the registrant's identity was masked behind a privacy service, Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC.

The disputed domain name resolves to a webpage displaying the heading "IPSEN BIOPHARM" with the mention "Launching Soon" and a "Contact Us" form, powered by GoDaddy Airo.

#### **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 its registered trademarks IPSEN and IPSEN BIOPHARMACEUTICALS, as it incorporates the mark IPSEN in its entirety together with the term "biopharm", which is a commonly used abbreviation of the term "biopharmaceuticals" and directly refers to the Complainant's trademark IPSEN BIOPHARMACEUTICALS.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant submits that it has never licensed or authorized the Respondent to use its marks, that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, that the disputed domain name resolves to a mere "Launching Soon" page devoid of any bona fide offering, and that the active MX records associated with the disputed domain name create a risk of phishing or fraudulent email activity incompatible with any legitimate interest.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, relying on the following cumulative factors: the international renown of the IPSEN mark, the deliberate and targeted combination of IPSEN with the abbreviation "biopharm", the passive holding of the disputed domain name, the risk of email fraud evidenced by active MX records, the Respondent's initial use of a

privacy service to conceal its identity, and the Respondent's failure to respond to three successive cease-and-desist letters sent in January and February 2026.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

## **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 Complainant holds, inter alia, United Kingdom Trade Mark No. UK00002146516 for IPSEN, registered on June 5, 1998, United States Registration No. 5171734 for IPSEN BIOPHARMACEUTICALS, registered on March 28, 2017, and United States Registration No. 4084238 for IPSEN, registered on January 10, 2012. All of these registrations predate the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds the mark IPSEN 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. The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's mark IPSEN in its entirety and appends the term "biopharm", which is a widely recognised abbreviation of "biopharmaceuticals", a term directly incorporated in the Complainant's trademark IPSEN BIOPHARMACEUTICALS.

Although the addition of the term "biopharm" may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of such term does not prevent the 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 for the applicable generic Top-Level Domain (".com"), this can be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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 recognised 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 with 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 it has not licensed, authorised, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to register or use any domain name incorporating its trademarks. There is no evidence on the record that the Respondent is or has ever been commonly known by the term "ipsenbiopharm" or any similar designation, or that it has any connection whatsoever to the Complainant or the pharmaceutical sector. The disputed domain name currently resolves to a "Launching Soon" page, and there is no evidence of any bona fide offering of goods or services via the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the Complaint indicates that the Respondent has connected the disputed domain names to email servers, which creates a serious risk that the Respondent may be using the disputed domain name, which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, for misrepresentations and/or phishing and spamming activities. See *Alain Afflelou Franchiseur v. Lihongbo, Lihongbo*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-2075](#). Panels have held that the use of a domain name for phishing or identity theft can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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 finds that the following circumstances, taken together, demonstrate that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

First, the Complainant's trademark IPSEN has been registered and in use for several decades, including in the United Kingdom, the jurisdiction where the Respondent is located, since at least June 1998. The trademark IPSEN BIOPHARMACEUTICALS has also been registered in the United States of America since 2017. The disputed domain name was registered on June 6, 2025, well after the Complainant's trademarks were established. Given the extensive use of the IPSEN mark in the pharmaceutical field, it is very unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its trademarks at the time of registration. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

Second, the disputed domain name combines the Complainant's core mark IPSEN with the term "biopharm", which is a direct abbreviation of BIOPHARMACEUTICALS, a term featured in the Complainant's own registered trademark IPSEN BIOPHARMACEUTICALS. This deliberate construction strongly suggests that the Respondent targeted the Complainant and its marks.

Third, the disputed domain name currently resolves to a page with the heading "IPSEN BIOPHARM" and the mention "Launching Soon", which constitutes passive holding. Panels have found that the non-use of a 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. On the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

Fourth, as mentioned in the section above, there is a serious risk that the Respondent may be using the disputed domain names for misrepresentations and/or phishing and spamming activities. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for phishing or identity theft constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under 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 <ipsenbiopharm.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Benoit Van Asbroeck/*

**Benoit Van Asbroeck**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 30, 2026