

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Cigna Corporation v. GrimRaptor, Grim Raptor
Case No. D2026-2575

1. The Parties

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

Respondent is GrimRaptor, Grim Raptor, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <cignacontact.sbs>, <cignaremotecareers.sbs>, <cignaremotecareers.top>, <cignaremotejobs.sbs>, <cignaremotejobs.top>, <employeeecigna.sbs> 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 15, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

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 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. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on July 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Scott R. Austin as the sole panelist in this matter on July 21, 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 following facts appear from the Complaint and its attached Annexes, which have not been contested by Respondent, and provide evidence sufficient to support:

Founded in 1982 via the merger of healthcare companies CG and INA, and headquartered in Bloomfield, Connecticut, United States, Complainant is a United States corporation and global health services company that has grown to employ over 70,000 people in more than 30 countries worldwide providing health- and insurance-related services under the trademark CIGNA (the “CIGNA Mark”).

Since Complainant's first U.S. registration for the CIGNA Mark (Reg. No. 1270224) registered on March 13, 1984 in connection with healthcare- and insurance-related services, Complainant has subsequently registered and holds over 100 active trademark registrations in the United States for such services, including U.S. Reg. Nos. 4298900 (registered on March 5, 2013) for CIGNA, 4298899 (registered on March 5, 2013) for CIGNA, 4392930 (registered on August 27, 2013) for CIGNA GLOBAL HEALTH BENEFITS, and 4455122 (registered on December 24, 2013) for CIGNA-HEALTHSPRING.

Complainant also owns numerous domain name registrations comprising the CIGNA mark (and variations thereof), such as <cigna.com>, <cigna.biz>, <cignamedical.com>, <cignachina.com.cn>, <cigna-health.com>, <cigna-healthcare.com>, <cignaemployeehealthcare.com> and <cignaemployersolutions.com>.

Pursuant to information received from a “Notice of Change - Multiple Underlying Registrants” provided by the Center on May 19, 2026 in a related pending UDRP action involving Complainant and its CIGNA Mark (*Cigna Corporation v. SamsonSmallz, Samson Smallz*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-1989](#)) Respondent registered four of the six disputed domain names, <cignaremotecareers.sbs>, <cignaremotecareers.top>, <cignaremotejobs.sbs>, <cignaremotejobs.top> with the Registrar NameSilo, LLC on March 6, 2026, and the remaining two, <cignacontact.sbs> and <employeeecigna.sbs> four days later on March 10, 2026; providing the same registrant contact information for each disputed domain name. When Complainant initially discovered the disputed domain names, the record submitted shows that at least <cignaremotecareers.top> resolved to a webpage that imitated Complainant and provided a purported “onboarding portal” for career opportunities associated with Complainant, but as of June 19, 2026, when the Center performed its standard access checks, none of the disputed domain names resolved to an active website, but returned NXDOMAIN or “503 Service Unavailable” results.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names. Complainant holds numerous trademark registrations for the CIGNA Marks across many jurisdictions around the world. Complainant shows in its annexes that it owns registered trademark rights, including those set out in Section 4 above. Complainant further relies on the goodwill and recognition that has been attained under the CIGNA Marks, which has become a well-known distinctive identifier for its products and services. Complainant shows that its CIGNA Marks are well-recognized by the public around the world.

Complainant asserts that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the CIGNA Marks because each of the disputed domain names clearly encompass one of Complainant's CIGNA Marks in full, only followed or preceded by various descriptive terms, none of which additions are sufficient to prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Complainant submits that there are no rights or legitimate interests held by Respondent in respect of the disputed domain names. Respondent is not commonly known by any of the disputed domain names, nor does Respondent have any authorization or license from Complainant to use the CIGNA Mark or to register any of the disputed domain names.

Complainant contends that the fact that each disputed domain name contains the CIGNA Mark together with an employment or job applicant term such as "careers" or "remotejobs" shows that the aim of Respondent in each case is to confuse Internet users searching for employment opportunities with Complainant into thinking that they had arrived at Complainant's website and to create a false link between Complainant's CIGNA Marks and each of the disputed domain names redirecting each to Complainant's copycat site incorporating a job applicant portal.

Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of any of the disputed domain names. Rather Respondent is using all six disputed domain names to create a false association with Complainant's brand initially to redirect consumers to a webpage that imitated Complainant and provided a purported "onboarding portal" for career opportunities associated with Complainant. Such use does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods and services and can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent, nor can such unauthorized impersonation constitute a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of any of the disputed domain names. Respondent's non-use of the remaining passively held disputed domain names does not confer it with a legitimate interest nor would use of a domain to further an illegitimate purpose.

Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. First, Complainant asserts that the CIGNA Marks are recognized worldwide and therefore Respondent must have been aware that it was registered as a trademark in various jurisdictions worldwide. Complainant's earliest CIGNA Mark registration also predates the registration of all of the disputed domain names by decades. Complainant submits, therefore, that Respondent knowingly registered each of the disputed domain names in bad faith with the intention of targeting Complainant's CIGNA Marks to trade off the goodwill and reputation attaching to Complainant's CIGNA Marks. Complainant contends that Respondent's use of the disputed domain names is to capitalize on the reputation of Complainant's trademark by diverting Internet users seeking Complainant's services to its original job applicant portal websites for financial gain, by intentionally creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's registered trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website and/or the employment opportunity services offered or promoted through the website. Complainant contends, therefore, that Respondent's conduct amounts to registration and use of each of the disputed domain names in bad faith.

Accordingly, Complainant requests transfer of all six of the disputed domain names.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules provides that the Panel is to decide the Complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, the Rules, and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

The onus is on Complainant to make out its case, and it is apparent from the terms of the Policy that Complainant must show that all three elements set out in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been established before any order can be made to transfer a domain name. As the proceedings are administrative, the standard of proof under the Policy is often expressed as the “balance of the probabilities” or “preponderance of the evidence” standard. Under this standard, an asserting party needs to establish that it is more likely than not that the claimed fact is true. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)), section 4.2.

Thus, for Complainant to succeed it must prove within the meaning of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy and on the balance of the probabilities that:

- (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

The Panel finds that Complainant has met its burden in all three elements of the Policy and addresses each element in turn below.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Complainant has established rights in the CIGNA Mark through its United States trademark registrations. A nationally or regionally registered trademark prima facie satisfies the threshold requirement of trademark rights for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. See also *Advance Magazine Publishers Inc., Les Publications Conde Nast S.A. v. Voguechen*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-0657](#); *Janus Int’l Holding Co. v. Rademacher*, WIPO Case No. [D2002-0201](#).

Complainant contends that each of the disputed domain names is recognizable in and therefore confusingly similar to Complainant’s CIGNA Marks. The Panel finds each disputed domain name incorporates the CIGNA Mark in its entirety. The additional terms “contact”, “remote careers”, “remote jobs”, or “employee” do not prevent the CIGNA Mark from being recognizable in the disputed domain names. Where the relevant trademark remains recognizable, the addition of descriptive or other terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. See also *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#).

Further, the addition of a generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”), in this case “.sbs” and “.top”, are standard registration requirements and are disregarded for purposes of the first-element comparison. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1. The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to a trademark in which Complainant has rights, and Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Complainant has established, prima facie, that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in each of the disputed domain names. Under the second element of the Policy, Complainant must first make out a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. If it does so, the burden of production shifts to Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests. If the respondent fails to come forward with such evidence, a complainant is generally deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1. See also *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. WalMart Careers, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2012-0285](#); *Belupo d.d. v. WACHEM d.o.o.*, WIPO Case No. [D2004-0110](#).

Complainant states that it has not licensed or otherwise authorized Respondent to use the CIGNA Mark or to register the disputed domain names. Nothing in the record indicates that Respondent has been commonly known by any of the disputed domain names, or that Respondent has made a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names.

The composition of the disputed domain names — the CIGNA Mark together with terms such as “remote careers”, “remote jobs”, “employee”, and “contact” — is apt to suggest sponsorship or endorsement by Complainant rather than to signal a separate legitimate source. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 2.5 and 2.5.1. The evidence of record further shows that <cignaremotecareers.top> was used for a webpage imitating Complainant and presenting a purported onboarding portal for career opportunities associated with Complainant.

Use of a domain name for a copycat site, passing off, phishing or other fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1. Similarly, the absence of authorization and of any showing that a respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name evinces Respondent’s lack of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. See, e.g., *Charles Jourdan Holding AG v. AAIM*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0403](#); *Compagnie de Saint Gobain v. Com-Union Corp.*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0020](#). Respondent failed to file a Response and therefore has failed to rebut Complainant’s prima facie case.

The Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that Respondent registered the disputed domain names with Complainant and the CIGNA Mark in mind. Complainant’s CIGNA trademark rights long predate Respondent’s March 2026 registrations, and the disputed domain names reproduce the CIGNA Mark together with terms directly referring to employment, careers, jobs, employees, or contact with Complainant.

Prior UDRP panels have held that the nature of a domain name incorporating a complainant’s mark together with a term corresponding to the complainant’s area of activity, the website content to which the domain name has pointed, and a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests are among the circumstances panels consider in assessing bad-faith registration. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1. Where a mark is widely known in its sector or highly specific, and the respondent cannot credibly claim unawareness, panels may infer that the respondent knew or should have known of the complainant’s rights. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

The use shown in the record confirms such targeting. Complainant’s evidence shows that <cignaremotecareers.top> was used for a webpage imitating Complainant and presenting a purported career “onboarding portal”. Such use is designed to capitalize on confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

Prior UDRP panels have found that mimicking a complainant’s website, seeking to cause confusion for the respondent’s benefit, and the absence of any conceivable good-faith use are evidence supporting bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4. See also *Accenture Global Services Limited v. Patel Holdings*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-0367](#); *Velcro BVBA v. Willie N. Eskridge*, WIPO Case No. [D2019-0598](#).

The apparent employment-related impersonation shown here is particularly probative. Prior panels have recognized that domain names used in fraudulent schemes directed to prospective job applicants, including through copycat sites or other deceptive communications would support a finding of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. The Panel therefore finds on the balance of probabilities that Respondent registered and used at least the disputed domain name <cignaremotecareers.top> to target Complainant and its CIGNA Mark for the abusive purpose of furthering a fraudulent job applicant scheme.

The fact that the disputed domain names were subsequently inactive when checked by the Center does not alter this conclusion. Non-use does not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith; panels consider the totality of circumstances, including the distinctiveness or reputation of the mark, the respondent's failure to provide evidence of contemplated good-faith use, and the plausibility of any good-faith use in light of the domain name's composition. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. See also *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#). Here, the disputed domain names incorporate the CIGNA Mark together with terms reinforcing an apparent connection to Complainant, Respondent has not answered the Complaint, and the record includes prior deceptive use of at least one disputed domain name. See *Do The Hustle, LLC v. Tropic Web*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0624](#).

The Panel finds that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith, and Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <cignacontact.sbs>, <signaremotecareers.sbs>, <signaremotecareers.top>, <signaremoteworks.sbs>, <signaremoteworks.top>, and <employeeecigna.sbs> be transferred to Complainant

/Scott R. Austin/

Scott R. Austin

Sole Panelist

Date: August 17, 2026