ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Haemonetics Corporation v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2026-4139

1. The Parties

Complainant is Haemonetics Corporation, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Abreu Karol LLC, United States.

Respondent is Name Redacted.[1]

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The Disputed Domain Name <haemonetics.careers> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 15, 2026. On September 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On September 17, 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 (Privacy Services provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on September 18, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on September 23, 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] Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party when registering the Disputed Domain Name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted Respondent's name from this Decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this Decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the Disputed Domain Name, which includes the name of Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in these proceedings and has indicated that Annex 1 to this Decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case.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.

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 20, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on October 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Richard W. Page as the sole panelist in this matter on October 28, 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

Complainant is a corporation validly existing under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, United States.

Complainant is based in Boston and is recognized worldwide as a leading provider of blood management solutions. Complainant is publicly traded on the New York Stock Exchange and has used the HAEMONETICS Mark in connection with blood-processing equipment and blood-management services since 1971.

Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for the HAEMONETICS Mark in the United States and many other jurisdictions, including without limitation the following:

United States Registration No. 1,057,423 for HAEMONETICS registered February 1, 1977 in international classes 9 and 10; and

United States Registration No. 5,232,710 for HAEMONETICS registered June 27, 2017 in international classes 9, 10, 35, and 42.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on September 4, 2026 and was immediately enrolled in a mail exchange ("MX") allowing for the sending and receiving of email in an impersonation and phishing scheme.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends the entirety of the HAEMONETICS Mark is contained within the Disputed Domain Name and the addition of other terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Here the additional term is the generic Top-Level Domain ".careers".

Complainant further contends that the HAEMONETICS Mark is distinctive in connection with computer software, processing equipment, consulting services, and computer services, all in the field of blood management. Complainant further contends that this is not a word a third party would legitimately choose unless seeking to create an impression of an association with Complainant. The use of the phrase "hamemonetics" is distinctive and unique to Complainant. Complainant has never licensed or otherwise permitted Respondent to use the HAEMONETICS Mark.

Complainant submits that Respondent is using a similar name to one of Complainant's employees and Complainant's corporate address in furtherance of a fraudulent phishing scheme. Complainant's employee has submitted a declaration stating that she and Complainant are victims of an impersonation attempt which is made in furtherance of the bad faith phishing scheme using the Disputed Domain Name.

Complainant further submits that Respondent's true use of the Disputed Domain Name is a deliberate attempt to take commercial advantage of Complainant's rights in the HAEMONETICS Mark and cannot be the basis for any rights or legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name.

Complainant further submits that Respondent is not affiliated in any way with Complainant and does not have permission to use the HAEMONETICS Mark. Respondent used the Disputed Domain Name as the email for a false recruiting identity to impersonate a real employee of Complainant. Use of the Disputed Domain Name for phishing or other illegitimate activity cannot confer rights or legitimate interests.

Complainant alleges that two days after registration of the Disputed Domain Name a job seeker received an unsolicited email using the name and the address of an employee in Complainant's HR department. The email purported to invite the recipient to proceed in Complainant's recruitment process for a "Remote Health Educator" position, identified the sender as Complainant's employee, used Complainant's Boston address, and directed the recipient to join a Microsoft Teams meeting.

Complainant further alleges that such activity demonstrates actual knowledge of Complainant's rights in the HAEMONETICS Mark and the bad faith intention behind Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name.

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs the Panel as to the principles the Panel is to use in determining the dispute: "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules, and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable."

Even though Respondent has failed to file a Response or to contest Complainant's assertions, the Panel will review the evidence proffered by Complainant to verify that the three essential elements of the claims are met. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.3.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that Complainant must prove each of the following three elements:

i) that the Disputed Domain Name registered by Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to the HAEMONETICS Mark in which Complainant has rights; and,

ii) that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name; and,

iii) that the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1 states that registration of a trademark, here the HAEMONETICS Mark, prima facie satisfies the threshold requirement of complainant having trademark rights for purposes of standing to file a UDRP case.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of the HAEMONETICS Mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

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 HAEMONETICS Mark and the Disputed Domain Name. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The entirety of the HAEMONETICS Mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the HAEMONETICS Mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The applicable Top-Level Domain in a domain name (here, ".careers") is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy allows three nonexclusive methods for the Panel to conclude that Respondent has rights or a legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name:

(i) before any notice to you [Respondent] of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Disputed Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

(ii) you [Respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

(iii) you [Respondent] are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the HAEMONETICS Mark.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on Complainant, panels have recognized that proving that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name may result in the difficult task of "proving a negative", requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of Respondent. As such, where Complainant makes out a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name (although the burden of proof always remains on Complainant). If Respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, Complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. Respondent has not rebutted 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 illegitimate activity, here claimed impersonation and phishing, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on 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 the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets forth four nonexclusive criteria for Complainant to show bad faith registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name:

(i) circumstances indicating that you [Respondent] have registered or you have acquired the Disputed Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Disputed Domain Name registration to Complainant who is the owner of the HAEMONETICS Mark or to a competitor of Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the Disputed Domain Name; or

(ii) you [Respondent] have registered the Disputed Domain Name in order to prevent the owner of the HAEMONETICS Mark from reflecting the HAEMONETICS Mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) you [Respondent] have registered the Disputed Domain Name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the Disputed Domain Name, you [Respondent] have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the HAEMONETICS Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product on your website or location.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name is in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed to be impersonation and phishing, constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <haemonetics.careers> be transferred to Complainant.

/Richard W. Page/
Richard W. Page
Sole Panelist
Date: October 29, 2026