ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Sanofi v. tednez kelehelpx
Case No. D2026-4291

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Sanofi, France, represented by Selarl Marchais & Associés, France.

The Respondent is tednez kelehelpx, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <sannofi.net> 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 23, 2026. On September 24, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 25, 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 PURPOSES) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 30, 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 amendment to the Complaint on September 30, 2026.

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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on October 1, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 21, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 22, 2026.

The Center appointed Marina Perraki as the sole panelist in this matter on October 27, 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 French multinational pharmaceutical company in over 100 countries, employing 100,000 people.

With consolidated net sales of EUR 43.63 billion in 2025, EUR 41.1 billion in 2024, EUR 43.07 billion in 2023, EUR 43 billion in 2022, EUR 37.7 billion in 2021, EUR 36.04 billion in 2020, EUR 34.46 billion in 2018, and EUR 35.05 billion in 2017, the Complainant ranks among the world's ten largest multinational pharmaceutical companies by prescription sales.

With Research and Development investment of EUR 5.9 billion in 2019, the Complainant's Research and Development portfolio includes 84 projects in clinical development.

The Complainant is the owner of SANOFI trademark registrations worldwide including, inter alia:

- the French trademark registration no. 96655339 for SANOFI (word), filed and registered on December 11, 1996, for goods and services in international classes 01, 03, 05, 09, 10, 35, 40, and 42;

- the European Union Trade Mark registration no. 000596023 for SANOFI, filed on July 15, 1997, and registered on February 1, 1999, for goods in international classes 03 and 05;

- the French trademark registration no. 3831592 for SANOFI (figurative), filed and registered on May 16, 2011, for goods and services in international classes 01, 03, 05, 09, 10, 16, 35, 38, 40, 41, 42, and 44, and

- the International trademark registration no. 1092811 for SANOFI, registered on August 11, 2011, for goods and services in international classes 01, 09, 10, 16, 38, 41, 42, 44.

The Complainant is also the owner of domain name registrations for SANOFI, including <sanofi.com>, registered on October 13, 1995; <sanofi.eu>, registered on March 12, 2006; <sanofi.fr>, registered on October 10, 2006; and <sanofi.net>, registered on May 16, 2003.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 6, 2026, and leads to an inactive website.

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

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists the three elements which Complainant must satisfy with respect to the disputed domain name:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; and

(ii) 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 Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark 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.

A domain name which consists of a variation of a trademark (typically a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling, referred to as typosquatting), here the addition of the letter "n" is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. . WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.9.

The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".net" is disregarded, as gTLDs typically do not form part of the comparison on the grounds that they are required for technical reasons only (*Rexel Developpements SAS v. Zhan Yequn,* WIPO Case No. D2017-0275).

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 has not submitted any response and has not claimed any such rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name. As per the Complainant, the Respondent was not authorized to register the disputed domain name and does not appear to be commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Respondent did not demonstrate prior to the notice of the dispute any use of the disputed domain name or a trademark corresponding to the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

On the contrary, the disputed domain name was asserted to have resolved to an inactive website.

The Panel finds that these circumstances do not confer upon the Respondent any rights or legitimate interests in respect of 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.

Considering that SANOFI mark had been widely used and registered by the Complainant at the time of the disputed domain name's registration and enjoyed reputation, the Panel finds it more likely than not that the Respondent had the Complainant's trademark in mind when registering the disputed domain name which incorporates the entirety of the Complainant's trademark.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. On the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, which is practically identical to Complainant's trademark with the sole repetition of the letter "n", as well as the Respondent's failure to submit a Response, 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 <sannofi.net> to be cancelled.

/Marina Perraki/
Marina Perraki
Sole Panelist
Date: November 11, 2026