

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

The Johns Hopkins University, The Johns Hopkins Health System Corporation, and Johns Hopkins Medicine International, L.L.C. v. Hanen Bent ELMABROUK, ALAEM TALYA AVIATION Services LLC
Case No. D2026-2561

1. The Parties

The Complainants are The Johns Hopkins University, United States of America ("United States"), The Johns Hopkins Health System Corporation, United States, and Johns Hopkins Medicine International, L.L.C., United States, represented by Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Hanen Bent ELMABROUK, ALAEM TALYA AVIATION Services LLC, United Arab Emirates.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <johnshopkinsclinic.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 June 12, 2026. On June 12, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 14, 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 (unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on June 19, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. On June 19, 2026, the Respondent sent an email communication to the Center. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint on June 23, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with 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 June 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 14, 2026. The Respondent sent a further email communication to the Center on July 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrea Mondini as the sole panelist in this matter on July 24, 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 Complainants are a world-renowned university and hospital system based in Baltimore, United States that used the HOPKINS and JOHNS HOPKINS trademarks for at least 140 years. Beginning in 1996, the Complainants adopted and began using the mark JOHNS HOPKINS MEDICINE to identify its entire medical enterprise. The Complainants offer healthcare consulting and educational services in North America, Latin America, Europe, the Middle East and Asia.

The Complainants own numerous trademark registrations in several jurisdictions, including:

TRADEMARK	JURISDICTION	REGISTRATION NUMBER	REGISTRATION DATE
JOHNS HOPKINS	United States	3949736	April 26, 2011

The Complainants hold several domain names containing the terms “Hopkins” and “Johns Hopkins”, among them <johnshopkins.com>.

The Respondent states that it operates a clinic in Dubai which it acquired in August 2024.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 12, 2025.

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolves to a website prominently displaying the Complainants’ trademark and purporting to offer medical, dental, cosmetic and other healthcare-related services under the name “Johns Hopkins Polyclinic” in Dubai.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainants contend as follows:

The trademark JOHNS HOPKINS has been extensively used to identify the Complainants and their services. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainants have rights, because it incorporates this trademark in its entirety, and the addition of the descriptive term “clinic” is not sufficient to prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainants to use the JOHNS HOPKINS trademark and there is no evidence of a legitimate noncommercial use of this trademark by the Respondent. On the contrary, the Respondent’s unauthorized use of the Complainants’ mark trades on the goodwill of the Complainants in the

healthcare fields.

The disputed domain name was registered in bad faith because it is obvious that the Respondent had knowledge of both the Complainants and their well-known trademark at the time it registered the disputed domain name.

The Respondent is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, by creating the false impression that the services offered on the website posted by the Respondent under the disputed domain are sponsored or authorized by the Complainants

B. Respondent

In its Response and in the further email communications sent by the Respondent to the Center, the Respondent contends in essence that it had purchased an existing medical clinic and invested substantial resources to operate a genuine medical business licensed by the competent authorities in the United Arab Emirates. The disputed domain name was publicly available for registration through the Registrar's registration platform. The Respondent acquired the disputed domain name through the normal public registration process in the reasonable belief that a domain name made publicly available for registration could lawfully be registered and used.

Immediately upon receiving correspondence from the Complainants regarding their concerns, the Respondent voluntarily undertook corrective actions such as removing the historical references to the Complainants and other content identified by the Complainants. The Respondent never intended to represent that the clinic was owned, managed, endorsed, licensed, or affiliated with the Complainants.

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed, a complainant must establish each of the following elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the 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.

6.1 Procedural Issue - Supplemental Filing

In its Supplemental Filing of July 24, 2026, the Respondent in essence repeated its previous allegations. In the Panel's view, this belated submission is therefore not relevant. Therefore, the Panel decides not to admit this Supplemental Filing.

6.2 Substantive Issues

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 Panel finds the entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name.

Although the addition of other terms such as here “clinic” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that 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.

The addition of the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com” in the disputed domain name is a standard registration requirement and as such may be disregarded under the confusing similarity test under the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i). [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 recognized that for a complainant to prove 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 Complainants have established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes at the outset that the Respondent states – without providing any supporting evidence – that it operates a business “Johns Hopkins Polyclinic” in Dubai under a license from the United Arab Emirates authorities. The website at the disputed domain name advertised medical and related services of Johns Hopkins Polyclinic (competing with the services offered by the Complainants). The evidence on file shows that it repeatedly referred to itself as “Johns Hopkins.” Further, although the Respondent asserts that it “has never claimed to be affiliated with, associated with, endorsed by, or connected to” the Complainants, the capture provided by the Complainants shows that, at the time of filing of the Complaint, the website displayed a logo very similar to the Complainants’ and referenced the Complainants’ establishment and its founding date in the “Our History” section. The Complainants have credibly shown that they have not authorized the Respondent to use the JOHNS HOPKINS trademark nor to advertise its services with reference to the Complainants. Incorporation of a company (assuming it exists) on its own, without further evidence of a legitimate business, cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests. Given the totality of circumstances of this case, and in the absence of any explanation by the Respondent for its choice of name, the Panel finds that the motive behind the registration of the disputed domain name was to free ride on the goodwill inherent in the Complainants’ mark.

Furthermore, although the Respondent has removed certain content such as the historical references to the Complainants, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name itself, coupled with the use to which it has been put, suggests the Respondent’s intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainants as to the origin or affiliation of the website.

Based on the available record, 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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

In the view of the Panel, noting that the Complainants' trademark registration predates the registration of the disputed domain name and considering that the Complainants' trademark is well known and that the disputed domain name resolves to a website featuring the Complainants' trademark and offering health care services and referencing the Complainants' hospital and its founding date, it is inconceivable that the Respondent could have registered or acquired the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainants' well-known trademark. In the circumstances of this case, this is evidence of registration in bad faith.

The composition of the disputed domain name and the impression given by the Respondent's website would cause Internet users to believe that the Respondent is somehow associated with the Complainants when, in fact, it is not. The Panel holds that by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainants' mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website in the sense of Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainants have established the third element of the Policy with regard to the disputed domain name.

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 <johnshopkinsclinic.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Mondini/

Andrea Mondini

Sole Panelist

Date: August 4, 2026