

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Emory University, Emory Healthcare, Inc. v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2026-3425

1. The Parties

Complainants are Emory University, United States of America ("United States"), and Emory Healthcare, Inc., United States, represented by The GigaLaw Firm, Douglas M. Isenberg, Attorney at Law, LLC, United States.

Respondent is Name Redacted¹.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <emoryhealthcare.team> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 1, 2026. On August 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 5, 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 (The RDAP server redacted the value, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainants on August 5, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainants filed an amendment to the Complaint on August 6, 2026.

¹ Respondent appears to have used the name of one of Complainant's employees to register the disputed domain name. In light of the apparent identity theft, the Panel has redacted Respondent's name from this Decision. The Panel has attached as Annex 1 an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name that includes the Registrar-confirmed registrant name. The Panel authorizes the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding and directs that Annex 1 not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#); see also *Sentara Healthcare v. Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-2416](#); *Tetra Laval Holdings & Finance S.A. v. Named Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-2034](#).

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 30, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on August 31, 2026.

The Center appointed Scott R. Austin 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

Without contest by Respondent, Complainants assert in the Complaint, as amended (only to add the Registrar identified registrant as respondent to the Complaint), and in its attached annexes provide sufficient evidence to support that:

Complainant Emory University, which controls its affiliate, Complainant Emory Healthcare, Inc., each a Georgia, United States corporation and headquartered in Atlanta, Georgia, United States (collectively, “Complainant”) provide educational and healthcare services identified under the service marks EMORY and EMORY HEALTHCARE (collectively, the “EMORY HEALTHCARE Marks”). Complainant operates an academic health care system that includes 11 hospitals and numerous provider locations in Georgia and its Emory Healthcare Network is the largest academically based, clinically integrated network in Georgia, employing more than 3,800 physicians across more than 580 provider locations.

Complainant owns trademark registrations for the EMORY HEALTHCARE Marks, including the following:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 2,382,245, EMORY, registered September 5, 2000, for, inter alia, educational services in International Class 41;
- United States Registration No. 2,222,078, EMORY HEALTHCARE registered February 2, 1999, for inpatient and outpatient medical services in International Class 42; and
- United States Registration No. 2,225,907, EMORY HEALTHCARE (stylized), registered February 23, 1999, for inpatient and outpatient medical services in International Class 42.

Complainant Emory University is the registrant of the domain name <emory.edu>, created on June 2, 1986, and used to access its primary website (the “Official Emory University Website”). Complainant is the registrant of the domain name <emoryhealthcare.org>, created on February 1, 2000, and which Complainant Emory Healthcare, Inc., uses to access its primary website (the “Official Emory Healthcare Website”).

The disputed domain name was created on July 13, 2026. It does not resolve to an active website. The evidence submitted with the Complaint shows, however, that the disputed domain name was configured with MX records and was used to send email in furtherance of an employment phishing scheme. In particular, an email sent from an address configured using the disputed domain name misrepresented the sender by using without permission the name of an employee of Complainant Emory Healthcare, Inc., in which the employee purportedly sought to schedule an interview with a prospective job applicant.

Following registrar verification, the Registrar disclosed registrant information in the name of an employee of Complainant, whose name has been redacted based on alleged identity theft together with a street address and telephone number associated with Complainant. In its August 6, 2026 amendment, Complainant explained that the individual whose identity was used to register the dispute domain name is an employee of Complainant who was impersonated in the phishing email; that the disclosed postal address and telephone number identify Complainant rather than the actual registrant; and that only the disclosed Proton email address appeared likely to be associated with the person who registered and used the disputed domain name. Complainant requested that the employee's name be redacted from the published decision.

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 name: that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark; that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

In view of Respondent's failure to submit any Response, the Panel shall decide these administrative proceedings on the basis of Complainant's undisputed representations pursuant to paragraphs 5(f), 14(a) and 15(a) of the Rules and draw such inferences as it considers appropriate pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules. The Panel is entitled to accept all reasonable allegations and inferences set forth in the Complaint as true unless the evidence is clearly contradictory. See *Talk City, Inc. v. Michael Robertson*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0009](#); see also *Microsoft Corporation v. Freak Films Oy*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0109](#).

Where no Response is filed, however, Complainant must still make out its case in all respects under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. To succeed, Complainant must demonstrate that all the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied.

The Panel will address its findings on each of these requirements in more detail below.

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. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.2.

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 Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of the EMORY and EMORY HEALTHCARE trademarks for the purposes of the Policy through its United States trademark registrations. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The second-level portion of the disputed domain name reproduces the EMORY HEALTHCARE mark in its entirety, with only the space between the words omitted. The applicable Top Level Domain “.team” is a standard registration requirement and is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.11.1. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the EMORY HEALTHCARE mark for purposes of the Policy. See also *Emory University, Emory Healthcare, Inc. v. gram troz*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4553](#); *Emory University, Emory Healthcare, Inc. v. Abadaba S.A.*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1241](#).

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 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 that Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Complainant has not authorized Respondent to register the disputed domain name or use the EMORY HEALTHCARE Marks. The record does not indicate that Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, or that Respondent has made any bona fide offering of goods or services or any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted Complainant’s prima facie showing.

Moreover, the record shows use of the disputed domain name for an employment phishing and impersonation scheme directed at prospective job applicants. Panels have categorically held that use of a domain name for illegal or illegitimate activity, including phishing, identity theft, passing off, or other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1. See *Emory University, Emory Healthcare, Inc. v. gram troz*, supra; *Inter-Continental Hotels Corporation v. Whois Agent, Whois Privacy Protection Service, Inc. / Fred Adams*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-0715](#); *Starwood Hotels & Resorts Worldwide Inc., The Sheraton LLC, Sheraton International Inc. v. infosheraton*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-2195](#).

The false registrant contact information further weighs against any claim of legitimate fair use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.3. The facts are also analogous to *BHP Billiton Innovation Pty Ltd v. Domains By Proxy LLC / Douglass Johnson*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-0364](#), in which no rights or legitimate interests were found where the respondent used a disputed domain name to send an email masquerading as the complainant’s human-resources department to arrange a job interview.

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.

The record supports the inference that Respondent knew of and specifically targeted Complainant and its EMORY HEALTHCARE Marks when registering the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name reproduces the EMORY HEALTHCARE Marks, which long predate the July 13, 2026 registration, and Respondent then used an email address at the disputed domain name while impersonating Complainant's Emory Healthcare, Inc., employee. In these circumstances, Respondent cannot credibly claim to have been unaware of Complainant or its marks. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.1.4 and 3.2.2. See *Emory University, Emory Healthcare, Inc. v. Abadaba S.A.*, supra; *Emory University, Emory Healthcare, Inc. v. gram troz*, supra.

Panels have held that use of a domain name for purposes other than hosting a website may constitute bad faith, including use for deceptive email, phishing, identity theft, and schemes seeking information from prospective job applicants. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Here, Respondent configured MX records for the disputed domain name and used an email address at the disputed domain name to impersonate Complainant in an employment phishing scheme. See *LinkedIn Corporation v. Daphne Reynolds*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-1679](#); *Inter-Continental Hotels Corporation v. Whois Agent, Whois Privacy Protection Service, Inc. / Fred Adams*, supra. The same principle is illustrated by *BHP Billiton Innovation Pty Ltd v. Domains By Proxy LLC / Douglass Johnson*, supra, involving a fraudulent human-resources job-interview email, and *Tetra Laval Holdings & Finance S.A. v. Named Redacted*, supra, involving phishing emails that misused an employee's identity.

The registration details supply an additional bad-faith indicator. The Registrar-disclosed name is that of Complainant's employee whom the phishing email impersonated, while the disclosed postal address and telephone number are associated with Complainant. Prior UDRP panels have viewed false underlying contact details, and a disclosed registrant identity that prima facie appears false, as relevant evidence of bad faith and an effort to shield illegitimate conduct. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.6 and 4.4.6.

On the totality of the circumstances, the Panel finds that Respondent registered the disputed domain name to target Complainant and its EMORY HEALTHCARE Marks and used them to further a phishing and impersonation scheme. Such conduct constitutes bad faith under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.1.4 and 3.4. The Panel finds that 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 <emoryhealthcare.team> be transferred to Complainant.

/Scott R. Austin/

Scott R. Austin

Sole Panelist

Date: September 15, 2026