

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Sanofi v. jungminhee, jungminhee (정민희, 정민희)
Case No. D2026-2729

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Sanofi, France, represented by Selarl Marchais & Associés, France.

The Respondent is jungminhee, jungminhee (정민희, 정민희), Republic of Korea ("Korea").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sanofi-copd.com> is registered with Gabia, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 23, 2026. On June 24, 2026, the Center transmitted to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 25, 2026, the Registrar transmitted to the Center its verification response disclosing the registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name. The Complaint did not provide a name or contact information of the Respondent. On June 29, 2026, the Center notified the Complainant, with a copy to the Respondent, in both English and Korean, of the registrant and its contact information as disclosed by the Registrar, and invited the Complainant to amend the Complaint adding the newly identified registrant. In the same correspondence, the Center also informed the Parties, in English and Korean, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Korean. On July 6, 2026, the Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint and requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission.

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, in both English and Korean, formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceeding commenced on July 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for the Response was July 27, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, on August 5, 2026, the Center, in both English and Korean, notified the Respondent's default and also stated:

“The Administrative Panel will be informed of your default. The Administrative Panel will decide in its sole discretion whether to consider your Response (if submitted later) in deciding the case.... Notwithstanding your default, we shall continue to send all case-related communications to you at the contact details and using the methods you have specified in your Response (if submitted later) or as we consider appropriate in our discretion (if not submitted).”

The Center appointed Professor Ilhyung Lee as the sole panelist in this matter on August 12, 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 describes itself as “a multinational company in the pharmaceutical field which develops, manufactures, distributes and sells a wide variety of pharmaceutical products under the trademark and trade name SANOFI.” The Complainant owns a number of SANOFI marks in several jurisdictions, including France (registration number 1482708, registered on August 11, 1988), European Union (registration number 004182325, registered on February 9, 2006), and the United Kingdom (registration number UK00001483425, registered on January 15, 1993).

The Complainant has also registered several domain names that incorporate “SANOFI”, including <sanofi.com> (registered on October 13, 1995) for its main website, and <sanofi.biz> (registered on November 17, 2001), which redirects to <sanofi.com>.

The disputed domain name <sanofi-copd.com> was registered on June 16, 2026. At the time of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a site that displayed a login form and the Complainant’s trademark SANOFI.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends principally that: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a 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. In addition, the Complaint (and Amended Complaint) states, inter alia:

“SANOFI ... rank[s] among the world’s ten largest multinational pharmaceutical companies by prescription sales.”

“SANOFI is a multinational company settled in more than 100 countries on all 5 continents employing 100,000 people”

“SANOFI is a major player on the worldwide pharmaceutical market.”

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions. Under paragraphs 5(f) and 14(a) of the Rules, the Panel may decide the dispute based on the Complaint. Paragraph 14(b) allows the Panel to draw appropriate inferences from the Respondent’s default.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Issue: Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Korean. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement. This provision further provides that the Panel has the authority to determine the language of the proceeding, having regard to the circumstances of the administrative proceeding.

The Complaint (and amended Complaint) was filed in English. The Complainant requested that English be the language of the proceeding, stating: “[T]he Complainant is not able to communicate in Korean”; “the litigious domain name <sanofi-copd.com> is registered in Latin characters rather than Korean script”; “the choice made by the Respondent in selecting English characters and terms in the disputed domain name advocates the fact he is inevitably acquainted with English language”; and “if the Complainant were to submit all documents in Korean, the administrative proceeding would be unduly delayed and the Complainant would have to incur substantial expenses for translation”.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties’ ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)), section 4.5.1.

Here, in the Center’s notification to the Respondent of the Complaint, the Center informed the Respondent of the pertinent provisions of paragraph 11(a) of the Rules and the Complainant’s request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Center also explicitly stated, in both English and Korean:

“Accordingly, the Respondent may submit any comments on the Complainant’s proposed language of the proceedings in its Response.

The Response may be filed in either Korean or English.

The Center will seek to appoint a Panel familiar with both languages mentioned above.”

The Respondent did not comment on the Complainant’s request that English be the language of the proceeding, and has defaulted.

Considering all relevant circumstances, the Panel determines that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2 Substantive Issues

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy 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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Complainant's SANOFI mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of "-copd" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements of paragraph 4(a), the Panel finds that the addition of such a term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com", a technical registration requirement, is disregarded in the consideration of this element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

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.

Here, the Complainant states that it "has never licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use its trademarks or to register any domain name including [its] trademarks", and has established a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. Thus, the burden shifts to the Respondent to demonstrate any such rights or legitimate interests. Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

The Respondent has defaulted. It 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 name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel is unable to ascertain any evidence that would demonstrate the Respondent's rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the Complainant must show that the disputed domain name "has been registered and is being used in bad faith." Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances that can satisfy this element. Other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Here, at the time of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website that displayed a login form and the Complainant's trademark SANOFI. The Complainant states that the disputed domain name resolved to "a logging webpage designed to illegally collect data during the Internet users' registration process." The Complainant also notes that the "-copd" term added to the SANOFI mark in the disputed domain name refers to "chronic obstructive pulmonary disease ..., a respiratory disease".

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for purposes other than to host a website may constitute bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. It appears that the Respondent's "behind the scenes" use here was intended to create confusion and divert the Complainant's followers on the Internet to an unauthorized site. In these circumstances, the Panel concludes that the requisite bad faith element is present.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has 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, and taking into account the Complainant's requested remedy, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <sanofi-copd.com> be cancelled.

/Ilhyung Lee/

Ilhyung Lee

Sole Panelist

Date: August 22, 2026