

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Hoffmann-La Roche Inc v. he jxing
Case No. D2026-3153

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Hoffmann-La Roche Inc, United States of America (“United States”), internally represented.

The Respondent is he jxing, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <rochediagnostics.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 21, 2026. On July 21, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 22, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 22, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on July 23, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 August 4, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 24, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 25, 2026.

The Center appointed Yuri Chumak as the sole panelist in this matter on September 2, 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, Hoffmann-La Roche Inc., is a United States company and a member of the Roche Group. The Complainant and its affiliated companies are engaged in the research and development of diagnostic products.

The Complainant owns United States trademark registrations for ROCHE, including:

- United States Registration No. 1395575 for ROCHE, registered on June 3, 1986, in Class 9;
- United States Registration No. 5363165 for ROCHE and design, registered on December 26, 2017, in Class 5; and
- United States Registration No. 5363167 for ROCHE and design, registered on December 26, 2017, in Class 9.

Prior UDRP panels have recognized the ROCHE mark as well known.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 6, 2026.

The disputed domain name resolved to a website displaying the ROCHE mark and purporting to offer diagnostic products and services.

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 name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the ROCHE mark because it incorporates the mark in its entirety. The addition of the terms "diagnostic" and "us" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity and reinforces an apparent association with the Complainant's diagnostic business in the United States.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant submits that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name for a website presenting itself as Roche Diagnostics does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant's trademark rights substantially predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The associated website demonstrates that the Respondent knew of and deliberately targeted the ROCHE mark. According to the Complainant, the Respondent sought to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a false impression that the website was operated by or affiliated with the Complainant.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to it.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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

Although the addition of other terms here, "diagnostic" and "us", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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 name. 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 name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for impersonation or passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant's trademark rights predate the registration of the disputed domain name by several decades. The composition of the disputed domain name and the content of the associated website demonstrate that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant and its ROCHE mark.

The Respondent used the disputed domain name for a website that presented itself as Roche Diagnostics, promoted diagnostic products and services, and solicited product configuration and demonstration requests. The commercial presentation of the website supports the inference that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the ROCHE mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the products and services promoted on it. This constitutes evidence of bad-faith registration and use under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for impersonation or passing off constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <rochediagnosticus.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Yuri Chumak/

Yuri Chumak

Sole Panelist

Date: September 11, 2026