

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Cigna Corporation v. Johnsonjohna, Johnson johna
Case No. D2026-2573

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Cigna Corporation, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Ladas & Parry LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Johnsonjohna, Johnson johna, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <alertcignacareer.cfd>, <alertcignacareer.sbs>, <alertcignacareers.cfd>, <alertcignacareers.sbs>, <alertcignacareers.top>, <alertcignacareer.top>, <alertscigna.cfd>, <alertscigna.sbs>, <alertscigna.top>, <cignaemployalert.cfd>, <cignaemployalert.sbs>, <cignaemployalerts.cfd>, <cignaemployalerts.sbs>, <cignaemployalerts.top>, <cignaemployalert.top>, <cignaemployeealert.cfd>, <cignaemployeealert.sbs>, <cignaemployeealerts.cfd>, <cignaemployeealerts.sbs>, <cignaemployeealerts.top>, <cignaemployeealert.top>, <cignahealthalert.cfd>, <cignahealthalert.sbs>, <cignahealthalerts.cfd>, <cignahealthalerts.sbs>, <cignahealthalerts.top>, <cignahealthalert.top>, <cignahealthcareer.cfd>, <cignahealthcareer.sbs>, <cignahealthcareers.cfd>, <cignahealthcareers.sbs>, <cignahealthcareer.top>, <cignahealthemploy.cfd>, <cignahealthemploy.sbs>, <cignahealthemploys.cfd>, <cignahealthemploys.sbs>, <cignahealthemploys.top>, <cignahealthemploy.top>, <cignahealthjob.cfd>, <cignahealthjob.sbs>, <cignahealthjobs.cfd>, <cignahealthjobs.sbs>, <cignahealthjobs.top>, <cignahealthjob.top>, <cignahealthnotifier.cfd>, <cignahealthnotifier.sbs>, <cignahealthnotifier.top>, <cignahealthnotify.cfd>, <cignahealthnotify.sbs> and <cignahealthnotify.top> are registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 22, 2026. On June 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 16, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the 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 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Angela Fox as the sole panelist in this matter on July 22, 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 United States corporation registered under the laws of the state of Delaware, United States. It is a global health services company with insurance subsidiaries that are major providers of medical, dental, disability, life and accident insurance in over 30 countries, including the United States, China, India, Indonesia, New Zealand, Republic of Korea, Spain, Thailand, Türkiye and the United Kingdom. It was founded in 1982 and now employs over 70,000 people internationally. The Complainant had net sales of approximately USD 275 billion in 2025 and has some 18 million global medical customers, 18 million global dental customers and 16 million United States customers covered under its insurance plans.

Since its incorporation, the Complainant’s business has been carried out under the trademark CIGNA and marks including CIGNA. The Complainant owns multiple United States trademark registrations for CIGNA and marks containing CIGNA, details of which were annexed to the Complaint, including:

- United States trademark registration No. 1,270,224 for CIGNA in Class 36, registered on March 13, 1984 with a first use date of April 18, 1982;
- United States trademark registration No. 4,298,900 for CIGNA Logo in Class 35, 36 and 44, registered on March 5, 2013 with a first use date of September 25, 2011; and
- United States trademark registration No. 4,298,899 for CIGNA Logo in Classes 35, 36 and 44, registered on March 5, 2013 with a first use date of September 11, 2012.

The first registration referred to above is in the name of the Complainant, but the second and third registrations, and all the other registrations listed in the annex to the Complaint, are in the name of Cigna Intellectual Property, Inc. The Complaint indicates that the Complainant owns these other registrations, and the Panel is satisfied that Cigna Intellectual Property, Inc. is an entity controlled by the Complainant.

The Complaint states that the Complainant also owns numerous domain name registrations comprising the CIGNA mark and variations of it, such as <cigna.com>, <cigna.biz>, <cignamedical.com>, <cigna-health.com>, <cigna-healthcare.com>, <cignaemployeehealthcare.com> and <cignaemployersolutions.com>.

All 50 of the disputed domain names were registered on March 10, 2026. While none of the disputed domain names link to an active web page, the Complainant states that most, if not all, of them linked at the time of the filing of the Complaint to parking pages hosting links purportedly relating to the Complainant and to employment opportunities at the Complainant’s company. Annexed to the Complaint was a screenshot of a parking page linked to the disputed domain name <alertcignacareers.sbs>, which contained links to, among other things, “Cigna Health Insurance”, “Cigna Health Care Provider” and “Hospital Job Openings”. The

public Whois records show a privacy service being used for all of the disputed domain names; the Registrar has confirmed a single underlying registrant for all of the disputed domain names.

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are all identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's CIGNA trademark as each one of them wholly incorporates the CIGNA mark together with one or two additional terms, such as, "health alerts", "employee alerts", "health jobs", "employee alerts", "health careers", "health notifier", etc. The Complainant submits that the addition of these terms does not distinguish the disputed domain names from the CIGNA mark because they merely refer to the Complainant's health-related services and/or imply a manner of receiving notifications regarding employment opportunities at the Complainant's company.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. There is no evidence that the Respondent has ever used the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain names. There is moreover no evidence that the Respondent has been making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names. The use in connection with parking pages hosting links purportedly relating to the Complainant or to job opportunities at the Complainant's company or in the health care field generally is not, the Complainant submits, a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, taking into account the inherently deceptive nature of the disputed domain names.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and have been used in bad faith. The Complainant argues that the Respondent's registration of 50 disputed domain names which all include the Complainant's mark and terms relevant to the Complainant's field or activity or to employment, and which resolve to parking pages with links to websites purportedly relating to the Complainant and to career opportunities in the healthcare field is evidence that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant when it registered the disputed domain names, and that it did so with the intention of benefiting commercially from the confusion of Internet users. The Complainant further points to the Respondent's use of a privacy shield to hide its identity as additional evidence of the Respondent's bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions and is in default.

6. Discussion and Findings

No exceptional circumstances explaining the Respondent's default have been put forward. Therefore, in accordance with paragraphs 14 (a) and (b) of the Rules, the Panel will decide the Complaint and shall draw such inferences, as it considers appropriate from the Respondent's default.

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, a complainant can only succeed in an administrative proceeding under the Policy if the panel finds that:

(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 the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

All three elements must be present before a complainant can succeed in an administrative proceeding under the Policy.

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's CIGNA mark is clearly present and recognizable within all of the disputed domain names. Although the addition of other terms, such as "alert", "cigna", "careers", "health", "notify", and "jobs", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between a disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's 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 Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes certain circumstances which, in particular, but without limitation, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

Under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, such circumstances include that by using a disputed domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or location or of a product or service on its website or location.

In this case, the Complainant has shown evidence that the Respondent has used one of the disputed domain names in connection with a parking page hosting links that clearly target the Complainant because they refer to the Complainant and its business, as well as hosting other links that relate to jobs in the healthcare field, which is the field in which the Complainant operates. The Complainant submits that most if not all of the 50 disputed domain names have been used in connection with such parking pages. The Respondent has made no effort to rebut that allegation, despite having had the opportunity to do so.

The disputed domain names are all inherently confusingly similar to the Complainant's CIGNA trademark, differing only in the addition of words that are relevant to healthcare, which is the field in which the Complainant operates, or to employment opportunities in the healthcare field, which are likely to be taken as pertaining to the Complainant's company in light of the fact that the disputed domain names all contain the Complainant's trademark CIGNA. The word CIGNA has no meaning in English and is inherently distinctive, and any use by the Respondent of the disputed domain names is likely to be calculated to attract visitors familiar with the CIGNA mark who are looking for a site owned or controlled by the Complainant. It is clear from the links on the parking page exhibited by the Complainant that the Respondent has intentionally sought to create such confusion and benefit from pay-per-click income arising from it in relation to at least one of the disputed domain names.

There is a clear likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, affiliation or endorsement of parking pages or websites linked to the disputed domain names. Moreover, there is no plausible use to which the Respondent could put the disputed domain names that would not be likely to deceive Internet users familiar with the Complainant's CIGNA mark. The Panel finds that the Respondent has been using the disputed domain names to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its online locations by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant.

The Panel notes that the Complainant provided only a representative sample to support its assertion that most if not all of the other disputed domain names were used in respect of parking pages hosting deceptive links. However, even without evidence that the other disputed domain names have been used in this way, or in any way, the overall circumstances surrounding the registration of 50 different disputed domain names in a single day, all including the Complainant's trademark and descriptive terms relevant to the Complainant's business, together with the Respondent's use of a privacy service to hide its identity and the provision of apparently false underlying registrant details, (e.g. with conflicting postal code and city), would support a finding of bad faith registration and use.

Taking all of this into account, the Panel concludes that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain names in bad faith. The Complainant has therefore 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 <alertcignacareer.cfd>, <alertcignacareer.sbs>, <alertcignacareers.cfd>, <alertcignacareers.sbs>, <alertcignacareers.top>, <alertcignacareer.top>, <alertscigna.cfd>, <alertscigna.sbs>, <alertscigna.top>, <cignaemployalert.cfd>, <cignaemployalert.sbs>, <cignaemployalerts.cfd>, <cignaemployalerts.sbs>, <cignaemployalerts.top>, <cignaemployalert.top>, <cignaemployeealert.cfd>, <cignaemployeealert.sbs>, <cignaemployeealerts.cfd>, <cignaemployeealerts.sbs>, <cignaemployeealerts.top>, <cignaemployeealert.top>, <cignahealthalert.cfd>, <cignahealthalert.sbs>, <cignahealthalerts.cfd>, <cignahealthalerts.sbs>, <cignahealthalerts.top>, <cignahealthalert.top>,

<cignahealthalert.top>, <cignahealthcareer.cfd>, <cignahealthcareer.sbs>, <cignahealthcareers.cfd>, <cignahealthcareers.sbs>, <cignahealthcareer.top>, <cignahealthemploy.cfd>, <cignahealthemploy.sbs>, <cignahealthemploys.cfd>, <cignahealthemploys.sbs>, <cignahealthemploys.top>, <cignahealthemploy.top>, <cignahealthjob.cfd>, <cignahealthjob.sbs>, <cignahealthjobs.cfd>, <cignahealthjobs.sbs>, <cignahealthjobs.top>, <cignahealthjob.top>, <cignahealthnotifier.cfd>, <cignahealthnotifier.sbs>, <cignahealthnotifier.top>, <cignahealthnotify.cfd>, <cignahealthnotify.sbs> and <cignahealthnotify.top> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Angela Fox/

Angela Fox

Sole Panelist

Date: August 4, 2026