

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

NIPRO Corporation v. he jxing
Case No. D2026-3624

1. The Parties

The Complainant is NIPRO Corporation, Japan, represented by Markmonitor Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is he jxing, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 13, 2026. On August 14, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 18, 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 August 27, 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 amended Complaint on August 31, 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 22, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Mihaela Maravela as the sole panelist in this matter on October 1, 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

According to information in the Complaint, the Complainant is a multinational healthcare and medical technology company headquartered in Osaka, Japan. It was founded in 1954, and has grown into a globally recognized manufacturer and supplier of medical devices, pharmaceutical products, pharmaceutical packaging solutions, and regenerative medicine technologies. The Complainant is particularly known for its longstanding expertise in renal care, including dialysis systems and related medical products. As of March 2026, the Complainant employed approximately 38,500 individuals worldwide. It entered the United States of America (or “United States”) market in 1983. The Complainant is listed on the Prime Market of the Tokyo Stock Exchange. For the financial year ended 31 March 2026, the Complainant reported consolidated net sales of approximately JPY 660.5 billion (around USD 4.3 billion).

The Complainant has provided evidence that it is the registered owner of various trademarks relating to its brand NIPRO, including, but not limited to the following:

- International trademark NIPRO (stylized), No. 750823, registered on September 13, 2000, for goods in class 10;
- United States trademark NIPRO (stylized), No. 3058373, registered on February 14, 2006, for goods in class 10; and
- the European Union trademark NIPRO (stylized), No. 014179485, registered on September 29, 2015, for goods and services in classes 11, 37, 40 and 42.

The Complainant operates primary websites from the domain names <nipro.co.jp> and <niprogroup.com>.

The disputed domain name has been registered on May 6, 2026, and at the date of the Complaint it resolved to an active website that appeared to offer commercial medical equipment branded as NIPRO. The website at the disputed domain name advertised dialysis machines, IVD laboratory equipment, bloodline systems, syringes, and renal consumables, and invited visitors to submit enquiries and quotation requests concerning such products. On June 26, 2026, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent requesting, inter alia, cessation of the use of the disputed domain name and its transfer to the Complainant. The Respondent did not respond to the letter. The disputed domain name no longer resolves to an active page at the date of the Decision.

The Respondent is (presumably) an individual reportedly located in China. No information is available on the Respondent except for the information made available by the Registrar.

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 incorporates the Complainant's NIPRO name and mark in its entirety, and only differs by the addition of “us”, most likely a geographical reference to the country “United States of America”.

With respect to the second element of the Policy, the Complainant argues that there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known as “nipro” or “nipro us” prior to or after the registration of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant and has not received any permission or consent from the Complainant to use its NIPRO mark. Furthermore, the Complainant has found no evidence that the Respondent owns any trademark incorporating the term “nipro” or “nipro us”. The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is not used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services because the Respondent’s website falsely suggests that it is operated by, endorsed by, or otherwise affiliated with the Complainant, as evidenced by: (i) the incorporation of the Complainant’s NIPRO trademark in the disputed domain name; (ii) the prominent use of the NIPRO name throughout the website, including in connection with the promotion of medical and renal-care products; (iii) the offering and advertisement of purported NIPRO products, including dialysis machines, IVD laboratory equipment, bloodline systems, and renal-care consumables; (iv) the solicitation of enquiries and quotation requests relating to NIPRO branded products from healthcare providers and procurement personnel; and (v) the absence of any clear disclaimer indicating that the website is unaffiliated with the Complainant. Further, the Complainant indicates that the Respondent’s website provides no basic company information, such as contact details, company name, registration number, or place of business and submits that the absence of such information is inconsistent with what would ordinarily be expected of a bona fide business.

As regards the third element, the Complainant contends that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with prior knowledge of the Complainant’s NIPRO mark and that the Respondent’s purpose was to interfere with the Complainant’s business. By diverting Internet users away from the Complainant’s official website to its own site for commercial gain, the Respondent has disrupted the Complainant’s business in terms of paragraph 4(b)(iii) of the Policy. Further, according to the Complainant, the Respondent’s website appears designed to create the false impression that it is operated by, authorized by, or otherwise affiliated with the Complainant. Rather than functioning as an independent website, it prominently adopts the Complainant’s NIPRO name and presents itself as a source of information and procurement support for purported NIPRO branded products. The website extensively references NIPRO dialysis machines, IVD laboratory equipment, bloodline systems, and renal-care consumables, while inviting visitors to request quotations and product information. Through its use of the Complainant’s trademark and its focus on the Complainant’s product lines, the website misrepresents a connection with the Complainant and is likely to lead Internet users to believe that it is an official NIPRO website or an authorized distributor of the Complainant’s products.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to “decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable”. Likewise, paragraph 10(d) of the Rules, provides that “the Panel shall determine the admissibility, relevance, materiality and weight of the evidence”.

No response has been received from the Respondent in this case. Even if the Respondent has not replied to the Complainant’s contentions, the Complainant still bears the burden of proving that all requirements are fulfilled. To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service 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.

The applicable standard of proof in UDRP cases is the “balance of probabilities” or “preponderance of the evidence”, and the Panel can draw certain inferences in light of the particular facts and circumstances of the case. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 4.2. Concerning the uncontested information provided by the Complainant, the Panel may, where relevant, accept the reasonable factual allegations in the Complaint as true. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.3.

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the trademark NIPRO 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, “us”) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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.

It is the settled view of panels applying the Policy that the Top-Level Domain (“TLD”) (here “.com”) should be disregarded under the first element test.

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.

The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the Complainant’s NIPRO mark or variations thereof. Also, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

According to the case file, the disputed domain name was used in connection to a website preeminently displaying the Complainant's NIPRO trademark, presenting the Complainant's products and inviting users to obtain more details in order to "Receive a concise comparison pack for Nipro products. Map service and validation documents before purchasing. Clarify consumable replenishment and distributor timing". There is no disclaimer of lack of affiliation between the Respondent and the Complainant. Rather, the website at the disputed domain name includes a section "About Nipro", stating that it is "Founded as a practical medical technology supplier for laboratories, renal care teams, and distributors that value documented specifications over broad claims". Such use creates a false impression of affiliation with the Complainant and does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services. Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for passing off, or other deceptive conduct, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1).

Furthermore, the website at the disputed domain name further invited Internet users to enter sensitive information such as name and email address. In the Panel's view, these elements demonstrate that the disputed domain name was being used for a website intended to induce Internet users into entering personal information, probably for phishing activities.

The Panel also finds that the composition of the disputed domain name, which contains the Complainant's NIPRO trademark in combination with the geographical term "us" (which stands for ISO 3166-1 alpha-2 two-letter country code for the United States), carries a risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Under the above circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but 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.

Generally speaking, a finding that a domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith requires an inference to be drawn that the respondent in question has registered and is using the disputed domain name to take advantage of its significance as a trademark owned by the complainant. The Panel considers that this is the case here. The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark, and according to the record it was registered decades after the first trademark registration of the Complainant. The addition of "us" in the disputed domain name is a further indication, having in mind that the Complainant has been present in the United States market for a long time and its NIPRO trademark has been registered in the United States since 2006. Moreover, the Respondent used the disputed domain name to host a website preeminently displaying the Complainant's NIPRO trademark presenting the Complainant's branded products, and inviting users to obtain more details about NIPRO products, which clearly indicates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademarks at the time of registration of the disputed domain name and was trying to pass itself off as being connected with the Complainant.

Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for passing off, or other deceptive conduct, constitutes evidence of bad faith under the Policy ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4). In the circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's NIPRO trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website. Such conduct constitutes evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Moreover, although the evidence provided by the Complainant does not prove actual phishing attempts, the Panel finds that in the circumstances of the case it is likely that the Respondent intended to use the sensitive information requested via the website at the disputed domain name for phishing purposes.

Also, there appears to be a pattern of abusive registrations by the Respondent, as, according to the information made available by the Complainant with the amended Complaint, the Respondent was involved in at least three previous UDRP proceedings where similar facts caused the concerned UDRP panel to decide in favor of the relevant complainant (See *Munters AB v. he jxing*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-2930](#); *Dart Container Corporation v. he jxing*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-2119](#); *American Labelmark Company d/b/a Labelmaster v. he jxing*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-1015](#)). This fact also supports a finding grounded on paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy, referring to a respondent registering "the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct".

The fact that the disputed domain name no longer resolves to an active website does not change the above findings in the circumstances of the case. Panels have found that the nonuse of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the long use of the Complainant's trademark, the previous use of the disputed domain name made by the Respondent and its failure to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of 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 <niprous.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mihaela Maravela/

Mihaela Maravela

Sole Panelist

Date: October 7, 2026