ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Orion Corporation v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2026-4163

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Orion Corporation, Finland, represented by Roschier (Brands), Attorneys Ltd., Finland.

The Respondent is Name Redacted.[1]

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <orionpharmausa.com> is registered with Squarespace Domains II LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 16, 2026. On September 17, 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 confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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").

[1] The 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 the 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 the 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1 to the Registrar as part of the order in these proceedings and has indicated that Annex 1 to this Decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case.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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 14, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Masato Dogauchi 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

The Complainant is a pharmaceutical company organized under the laws of Finland. It was founded in 1917. It entered the global market in the 1970s and currently its products are sold in over a hundred countries.

Its net sales in 2025 were over EUR 1.8 billion. It has approximately 4000 employees around the world and its shares are listed on Nasdaq Helsinki.

The Complainant has registered ORION and ORION PHARMA trademarks, such as:

- European Union Trademark Registration No. 011546215 for ORION, registered on September 5, 2013;
- International Trademark Registration No. 643152 for ORION, registered on August 7, 1995; and
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 018002253 for ORION PHARMA, registered on July 26, 2022.

The Complainant is also the owner of several domain name registrations containing the trademarks ORION and ORION PHARMA, such as, <orion.fi> and <orionpharma.com>. The domain name <orionpharma.com> is being used as the Complainant's main email domain.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 26, 2026. There are multiple people who have reported job scams to the Complainant showing emails in which the Respondent impersonates the Complainant by sending emails created under the disputed domain name.

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.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 15(a), a panel shall decide a case on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable. Since the Respondent has not made any substantive arguments in this case, the following decision is rendered on the basis of the Complainant's contentions and other evidence submitted by the Complainant.

In accordance with the Policy, paragraph 4(a), in order to qualify for a remedy, the Complainant must prove each of the following:

(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.

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 disputed domain name includes the entirety of the trademarks ORION and ORION PHARMA owned by the Complainant which are clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name. The additional term "usa" and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), ".com" in the disputed domain may be disregarded in determining the first element as the latter is a standard registration requirement. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 1.8 and 1.11.1.

Taken together, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademarks in which the Complainant has rights. Accordingly, 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 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 was originally established in 1917 and has been doing business in the global pharmaceutical market since 1970s. The Panel finds it unlikely that the disputed domain name was registered without knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark.

With regard to the requirement that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith, the Panel notes that, according to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to mislead job applicants. The use of the disputed domain name for fraudulent phishing emails attempting to impersonate employees of the Complainant and to mislead recipients falls under the concept of use of a domain name in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4.

Accordingly, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <orionpharmausa.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Masato Dogauchi/
Masato Dogauchi
Sole Panelist
Date: October 31, 2026