ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

# ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Super - Pharm (Israel) ltd. v. zhang zc, super ace
Case No. D2026-3310

## 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Super - Pharm (Israel) ltd., Israel, represented by Gilat, Bareket & Co., Israel.

The Respondents are zhang zc, Hong Kong, China, and super ace, United Kingdom.[1]

## 2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <superpharmaph.cfd>, <superpharmaph.click> and <superpharmaph.sbs> are registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

## 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 27, 2026. On July 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 28, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Dynadot Privacy Service, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 29, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on August 2, 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”).

[1]Both collectively referred to as “the Respondent”, unless reference is made to any of them individually.

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondents 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 Respondents' default on August 25, 2026.

The Center appointed Reyes Campello Estebaranz as the sole panelist in this matter on August 31, 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

Established in 1978, the Complainant is an Israeli pharmacy and retail chain operating under the SUPER-PHARM brand, with a nationwide network of over 300 stores and an ecommerce platform at "www.shop.super-pharm.co.il" (formerly "www.super-pharm.co.il"). The Complainant also operates internationally.

The Complainant holds various trademark registrations for the SUPER-PHARM Mark, including European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 004542114, SUPER-PHARM (word), registered on September 22, 2006; United Kingdom Trade Mark Registration No. UK00002116075, SUPER-PHARM (word), registered on May 11, 2001; and Chinese Trademark Registration No. 4460502, SUPER-PHARM (word), registered on March 28, 2008, (collectively referred to as the "SUPER-PHARM Mark").

The Complainant also owns domain names and subdomains names incorporating its SUPER-PHARM Mark, including <super-pharm.co.il> and <shop.super-pharm.co.il>, which resolve to its official ecommerce website.

The disputed domain name <superpharmaph.click> was registered on March 10, 2026; the disputed domain name <superpharmaph.sbs> was registered on April 8, 2026; and the disputed domain name <superpharmaph.cfd> was registered on April 30, 2026.

All the disputed domain names resolve to similar English-language websites that purportedly offer online gambling and casino services targeting users in the Philippines. These websites prominently display the designation "Superpharma PH" in their headers and throughout their content, promoting themselves as a premier destination for Filipino players. The websites fail to disclose any information regarding their legal ownership or the registrant of the disputed domain names (other than using the designation "Superpharma PH"), nor do they clarify their complete lack of affiliation or relationship with the Complainant or its trademark.

## 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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the SUPER-PHARM Mark has acquired substantial recognition and reputation within its sector, providing independent third-party publications to substantiate this status.

The Complainant further asserts that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the SUPER-PHARM Mark, as they incorporate this trademark in its entirety with the simple addition of the letters "aph", leaving the mark clearly recognizable within the disputed domain names. The possible reference of the letters "ph" to the Philippines does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Additionally, the generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs"), namely ".cfd", ".sbs", and ".click", are standard technical components of domain names that should be disregarded for the purposes of the confusing similarity test under the first element.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names and, based on publicly available trademark registers, the Respondent holds no trademark rights corresponding to them. Furthermore, the Respondent has not been authorized to use the Complainant's SUPER-PHARM Mark, nor is it using the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The Respondent's websites are commercial platforms offering gambling-related services that bear no relationship to the term "superpharm". Additionally, the Respondent's websites are suspected of engaging in phishing and other deceptive activities, as evidenced by ScamAdviser reports provided by the Complainant.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. Given the reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the Respondent knew or should have known that the disputed domain names were confusingly similar to this mark, making it impossible to conceive of any plausible circumstance in which the Respondent could legitimately use them. The Respondent failed to fulfill its responsibility to verify whether the disputed domain names infringed upon any third-party trademark rights. The Respondent's conduct is intended to capitalize on and free-ride upon the reputation of the Complainant's mark for commercial gain by intentionally seeking to attract Internet users to its websites through confusion. Furthermore, registering a well-known trademark as a domain name constitutes clear evidence of bad faith in itself, and registering three infringing domain names demonstrates a deliberate pattern of bad faith conduct targeting the Complainant.

**B. Respondent**

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

**6. Discussion and Findings**

The Complainant has made the relevant assertions required under the Policy, and the dispute properly falls within its scope. The Panel has the authority to decide the dispute by examining the three elements set forth in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, taking into account all relevant evidence, annexed materials, and allegations, and may conduct limited independent research pursuant to the general powers of the Panel, as articulated, inter alia, in paragraph 10 of the Rules.

**A. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents**

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the disputed domain names are under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the disputes against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names were registered within a period of less than two months through the same Registrar. Furthermore, according to the evidence provided by the Complainant, the websites associated with all three disputed domain names display similar content and feature a registration button that redirects Internet users to the same signup page.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

**B. 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 3.1, section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy, namely the SUPER-PHARM Mark. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are 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, the element "aph", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such element 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 Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

**C. 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel notes that the Respondent's names share no similarities with the disputed domain names. The Panel has also confirmed that neither of the registrants holds any trademark rights over these terms. In this regard, the Panel has conducted limited independent research on the Global Brand Database.[2]

---

[2]Under the general powers articulated in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, a panel may undertake limited factual research into public records if such information is useful to assessing the case merits and reaching a decision. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.8.

Although the Panel further observes that the terms included in the disputed domain names may be perceived as having dictionary or common meanings (the word "super" means extremely good, higher in quality or degree, or very large;  the word "pharm" is a common abbreviation for pharmaceutical, pharmacist, or pharmacy, and can also refer to a facility that breeds modified organisms to produce medicines;  similarly, the word "pharma" is an informal abbreviation for the pharmaceutical industry or a pharmaceutical company; and the letters "pH" is a standard chemical measurement used to indicate how acidic or basic a liquid is on a scale from zero to 14, while also serving as a common abbreviation or country code for the Philippines), merely registering a domain name comprised of dictionary or descriptive terms does not in itself automatically confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent and panels will consider the overall facts and circumstances of the case when assessing such arguments.  Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that the overall circumstances of the case indicate that the disputed domain names, which reproduce the Complainant's trademark and resolve to gambling websites, aim to trade off on the Complainant's mark for commercial gain and thus a finding of rights or legitimate interests is prevented. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.10.1.

According to the evidence provided by the Complainant, a third-party report from ScamAdviser concluded that the Respondent's websites may potentially be used for phishing or fraudulent activities, which can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.  WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds that there is insufficient evidence on the record to conclude that the Respondent has actively used the disputed domain names in the context of an operational phishing scam.  Nevertheless, it remains striking that the Respondent has failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie showing or present any evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.  Consequently, the Panel finds that the second element of the Policy under paragraph 4(a)(ii) has been established.

**D. 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 operates, and the SUPER-PHARM Mark has been continuously used in the market for over 40 years, in Israel.  Furthermore, the Complainant operates internationally and holds trademark registrations in China, which is identified as the location of one of the underlying registrants in the Registrar-disclosed records for one of the disputed domain names.

The Panel further notes that the Complainant and its trademark have a strong online presence.

The Complainant has provided additional evidence demonstrating the reputation of its trademark within the pharmaceutical sector, submitting specialized industry publications that recognized the Complainant's SUPER-PHARM Mark as the "best global drug chain" and the "world's most internationally focused drug chain" in 2010.

The Panel further considers that the composition of the disputed domain names, which incorporate the Complainant's trademark in its entirety without any rights or legitimate interests on the part of the Respondent to justify their selection, reveals to the Panel an intention of capitalizing on the likelihood of confusion or establishing a false affiliation with the Complainant's trademark.  The Respondent's failure to submit a Response or offer any plausible explanation for its choice of the disputed domain names also strengthens the inference of bad faith.

The circumstances of this case reveal an intention to profit from confusion with these marks in the absence of any legitimate interests, which, in the Panel's view, constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.  By using the disputed domain names, the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its websites.

Furthermore, the registration of three disputed domain names targeting the same terms and, consequently, the same trademark (or trademarks), constitutes a pattern of bad faith conduct.

Accordingly, having reviewed the available record, the Panel concludes on a balance of probabilities that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names 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 names <superpharmaph.cfd>, <superpharmaph.click> and <superpharmaph.sbs> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Reyes Campello Estebaranz/*
**Reyes Campello Estebaranz**
Sole Panelist
Date: September 14, 2026