

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Cigna Corporation v. jj, John John
Case No. D2026-2574

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is jj, John John, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <cignaalertemployer.cfd>, <cignaalertemployer.sbs>, <cignaalertemployer.top>, <cignaalertscareer.cfd>, <cignaalertscareer.sbs>, <cignaalertscareer.top>, <cignacareeremploy.top>, <cignaremotenote.cfd>, <cignaremotenote.sbs> and <cignaremotenote.top> (singularly, a “Domain Name” and, collectively, the “Domain Names”) are registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 8, 2026. On June 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Names. On the same day, 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 a response was July 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit a response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 16, 2026.

The Center appointed A. Justin Ourso III as the sole panelist in this matter on July 23, 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 well-known global health services company with subsidiaries providing medical, dental, disability, life, and accident insurance to consumers in over thirty countries under its CIGNA trademark for over forty years, since the merger of CG and INA in 1982.

The Complainant owns a United States registration, No. 1,270,224, for its CIGNA trademark, issued on March 13, 1984, with a first use as early as 1982, in Class 36 for insurance and financial services, and over 100 other registrations for the trademark, and for figurative versions of the trademark, in this and other jurisdictions around the world.

The Complainant owns over 250 domain names consisting of or incorporating its CIGNA trademark, or variations of the mark, including the domain names <cigna.com>, registered on January 17, 1992; <cignaemployeehealthcare.com>, registered on March 6, 2000; and <cignaemployersolutions.com>, registered on December 5, 2017.

The Respondent registered the Domain Names on March 10, 2026, without authorization from the Complainant, and provided false contact details to the Registrar. Prior to the filing of the Complaint and during the preparation of this Decision, the Domain Names each redirected to web pages parked at “www.findonlineresults.com”, which is protected by a privacy service. These web pages feature pay-per-click (“PPC”) links, including links to sites offering competing services.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy to transfer the Domain Name, which it requested. Notably, the Complainant contends that it has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks right or legitimate interests; the Domain Names redirect to parked pages with links¹ to sites that imply that they are related to employment opportunities with the Complainant; and the Respondent targeted the Complainant to obtain commercial gain through the use of fraudulent career opportunity alerts trading on its mark.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not respond to the Complaint.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Multiple Domain Names

The Complainant initiated a proceeding against an unknown Respondent for the registration and use of 144 Domain Names. After Registrar verification disclosed that five different registrants had registered the Domain Names, and the Center provided contact details to the Complainant, the Complainant withdrew its

¹ The Complainant offered as evidence a “screenshot” of one of the landing pages, which lacked the URL for the landing page dated May 22, 2026. The better practice is to include the URL.

initial complaint and filed separate Complaints, each naming one of the five registrants as a respondent. This proceeding arises from one of those complaints.

A proceeding may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the same person registered the domain names. Rules, paragraph 3(c); WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions 3.1 ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.11.1. The Panel finds that the Respondent registered all ten Domain Names that are the subject of the Complaint, and concludes that the inclusion of all the Domain Names in this proceeding is proper.

B. Elements of a Claim

A complainant must prove three elements to obtain relief: (i) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the complainant has rights; (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the domain name; and (iii) the respondent registered and is using the domain name in bad faith. Policy, paragraph 4(a).

i. Identical or Confusingly Similar

On the first element, a complainant must prove that (1) it has rights in a trademark, and (2) the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to this trademark. Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i).

The Panel finds that the Complainant's registrations establish its trademark rights. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

Each of the Domain Names incorporates the entire CIGNA trademark, and the trademark is readily recognizable within each Domain Name, notwithstanding the addition of two other words after the trademark in each. The Panel finds that each Domain Name is confusingly similar to the trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.8. Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has proven the first element: each of the Domain Names is confusingly similar to a trademark in which it has rights.

ii. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Respondent has not claimed the existence of any circumstance under the Policy, paragraph 4(c), that demonstrates that a respondent has rights to, or legitimate interests in, a domain name. The Complainant, on the other hand, has shown that it established its trademark rights long before the Respondent registered the Domain Names, it has not authorized the Respondent to use its trademark or the Domain Names, the Respondent is not known by the Domain Names, and the Respondent is not making a legitimate commercial or noncommercial use, and is not making a fair use of the Domain Names. This is a showing prima facie that the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names under the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(ii), shifting the burden of production on this second element to the Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence proving rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1. The Respondent has not submitted any evidence to rebut the prima facie showing.

The Panel also finds that the Domain Names resolve to web pages that compete with the Complainant, by featuring PPC links for competing services. The Panel finds that the two-word descriptive element included in the Domain Names suggests ownership, sponsorship, or endorsement by the trademark owner, [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. This implied affiliation with the Complainant is not a bona fide commercial use, a noncommercial use, or a fair use of the Domain Names. To the contrary, the evidence shows an intended use for unfair commercial gain. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 2.5.

Additionally, the Panel finds that the Registrar identified the Respondent by a name that does not resemble the trademark or the Domain Names and provided an email address for the Respondent that does not resemble the trademark or the Domain Names, which corroborate that the Respondent is not known by the Domain Names. Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has proven the second element: the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names.

iii. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Policy provides that the following circumstance is “evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith: [...] by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your web site [...], by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your web site or location or of a product or service on your web site.” Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

The Panel finds that the descriptive two-word element added after the CIGNA mark in the Domain Names betrays an intent to associate misleadingly the Domain Names with the Complainant’s trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4. Additionally, because of the distinctiveness and fame of the Complainant’s coined, or minted, mark; the failure of the Respondent to respond to the Complaint or to provide evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use; the Respondent’s providing false contact details to the Registrar; and the implausibility of any good-faith use for registering all ten Domain Names on the same day, the Panel finds that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant’s trademark, and of its rights in the mark, at the time that the Respondent registered the Domain Names; the Respondent’s registration and use of the Domain Names targeted the Complainant’s mark; and the Domain Names are intended to attract, misleadingly and deceptively, customers and potential customers of the Complainant to the Respondent’s redirected landing pages, for the Respondent’s commercial gain. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.1.2, 3.1.4, 3.2.1, and 3.2.2.

These findings compel the Panel to conclude that the Respondent intentionally registered the Domain Names in bad faith to take unfair advantage of the Complainant’s trademark and that the Respondent is using the Domain Names in bad faith intentionally to attract Internet users to its landing pages for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark as to the source of the PPC links on the landing pages or the source of the services offered through these links, in violation of the Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv). Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has proven the third element: the Respondent registered and is using the Domain Names in bad faith.

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 Domain Names, <cignaalertemployer.cfd>, <cignaalertemployer.sbs>, <cignaalertemployer.top>, <cignaalertscareer.cfd>, <cignaalertscareer.sbs>, <cignaalertscareer.top>, <cignacareeremploy.top>, <cignaremotenote.cfd>, <cignaremotenote.sbs> and <cignaremotenote.top>, be transferred to the Complainant.

/A. Justin Ourso III/

A. Justin Ourso III

Sole Panelist

Date: July 27, 2026