

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Cigna Corporation v. Donna Kite
Case No. D2026-2576

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 Donna Kite, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <careerscignahealth.cfd>, <careerscignahealth.sbs>, and <careerscignahealth.top> ("The Disputed 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 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 sent an email communication to Complainant on June 24, 2026, providing additional contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant replied to the Center's communication Complaint on June 30, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 26, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on July 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Colin T. O'Brien as the sole panelist in this matter on July 30, 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

Complainant is a global health services company with insurance subsidiaries that are major providers of medical, dental, disability, life and accident insurance offered to consumers in over 30 countries.

Complainant was founded in 1982 and has grown to employ over 70,000 people across the globe. Complainant had a net sales of approx. USD275 billion in 2025 and is ranked 13 on the Fortune 100. Complainant has 18 million global medical customers, 18 million global dental customers and 16 million U.S. customers covered under its insurance plans, and continues to expand its operations.

Complainant's first U.S. registration for the CIGNA word mark (Reg. No. 1270224), was registered on March 13, 1984 and is still active. The CIGNA mark is also the subject of several other trademark registrations in the United States, including Reg. Nos. 4298900, and 4298899 both registered on March 5, 2013; No. 4392930 registered on August 27, 2013 for the mark CIGNA GLOBAL HEALTH BENEFITS; and No. 4455122 registered on December 24, 2013 for the mark CIGNA HEALTHSPRING, to name a few, all covering health and insurance-related services.

Complainant owns numerous domain name registrations comprising the CIGNA mark (and variations thereof), such as <igna.com>, <igna.biz>, <ignamedical.com>, <ignachina.com.cn>, <igna-health.com>, <igna-healthcare.com>, <ignaemployeehealthcare.com> and <ignaemployersolutions.com>.

The Disputed Domain Names <careersignahealth.sbs>;<careersignahealth.cfd> and <careersignahealth.top> were registered on March 11, 2026, and they resolve to either error or blocked pages.

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.

Notably, Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Names are almost identical to the CIGNA mark as they each wholly incorporate Complainant's Mark together with the terms "career" and "health". The inclusion of these terms is not distinguishable because they merely reference Complainant's healthcare services and/or imply a manner of receiving notifications regarding job employment opportunities at Complainant's company. The Disputed Domain Names are nearly identical to many domain name registrations under which Complainant conducts its business such as <igna.com>, <ignaemployeehealthcare.com> and <ignaemployersolutions.com>.

Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Names. There is no evidence that Respondent made any effort to use the Disputed Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. There is no evidence that Respondent has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Names. There is no evidence that Respondent has been making legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Names.

Without Complainant's authorization or consent, Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Names, which are all clearly nearly identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's CIGNA trademark. While none of the Disputed Domain Names currently resolve to an active webpage, Respondent's selection of domain names incorporating Complainant's CIGNA mark in its entirety, combined with the generic health or job alert-related terms is not bona fide use and does not confer any rights or legitimate interests in Respondent.

Respondent registered three domain names that are all confusingly similar to Complainant's CIGNA mark, and the Disputed Domain Names, at one point, resolved to a webpage that blatantly imitated a portal for accessing career opportunities at Complainant's company. This use of the Disputed Domain Names not only indicates that Respondent was aware of Complainant and its well-established CIGNA mark but also demonstrates that Respondent was trying to obtain commercial gain from Complainant's well-established reputation for the CIGNA brand. In essence, the Disputed Domain Names were registered for the sole purposes of defrauding Complainant's consumers for financial gain through the use of domain names that imply career opportunities being offered by Complainant, which clearly demonstrates bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Complainant has demonstrated it owns registered trademark rights in the CIGNA mark. The generic Top Level Domains ("gTLD") ".cfd", ".sbs" and ".top" are viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such may be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.11.1. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Names reproduce the CIGNA mark in its entirety. The Panel finds the addition of the terms "careers" and "health" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Names 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 mark in which Complainant has rights and the first element of the Policy is established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Complainant has presented a prima facie case that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Names and has not been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Names. The fact that Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Names which incorporate Complainant's registered and famous CIGNA trademark and merely adds terms related to Complainant's activities and employment opportunities, indicates to the Panel that Respondent likely sought to impersonate Complainant and piggyback on the mark for potential illegitimate purposes.

After a complainant has made a prima facie case, the burden of production shifts to a respondent to present evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. See, e.g., *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0455](#) and [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Here, Respondent has failed to participate in the proceedings and as such, it did not provide any evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the nature of the Disputed Domain Names carries a risk of an implied affiliation as they effectively impersonate or suggest sponsorship or endorsement by Complainant. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

In the absence of any evidence rebutting the Complainant's prima facie case indicating Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Names, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Disputed Domain Names were registered decades after Complainant first used its CIGNA marks. The evidence provided by Complainant makes it clear to the Panel that Respondent knew or should have known of Complainant's CIGNA marks and that it had no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names when it registered them.

Moreover, UDRP panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

The Panel finds that the only plausible explanation for Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Names is for illegitimate and bad faith purposes. In addition, in view of [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3, the current state of the Disputed Domain Names, resolving to either error or blocked pages, does not prevent a finding of bad faith, particularly noting the reputation of the CIGNA mark, the composition of the Disputed Domain Names clearly targeting the CIGNA mark, and the lack of response from Respondent to refute Complainant's allegations.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that 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 <careerscignahealth.cfd>, <careerscignahealth.sbs>, and <careerscignahealth.top> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Colin T. O'Brien/

Colin T. O'Brien

Sole Panelist

Date: August 13, 2026