

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Providence Health & Services – Washington v. Beraha Sellem, Providence Healthcare Solutions

Case No. DAI2026-0065

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Providence Health & Services – Washington, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Beraha Sellem, Providence Healthcare Solutions, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <providencehealthcare.ai> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 26, 2026. On June 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 30, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 1, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on July 1, 2026. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 9, 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 July 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 30, 2026. The Respondent did not file any formal response. The Center commenced the panel appointment process on August 3, 2026.

The Center appointed Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa as the sole panelist in this matter on August 12, 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 faith-based health care system registered as a nonprofit corporation in the state of Washington, United States, operating 51 hospitals across five states. It is the proprietor of several trademarks, including the following:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 8073348 for PROVIDENCE (word mark), registered on December 23, 2025 for services in class 44, claiming a date of first use in 1859;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 5235246 for PROVIDENCE (device mark), registered on July 4, 2017 for services in class 44.

In addition, the Complainant's affiliate is the proprietor of United State Trademark Registration No. 3985608 for PROVIDENCE HEALTH PLAN (word mark), registered on June 28, 2011 for services in class 36, claiming a date of first use in 1997.

The Complainant operates websites at the domain names <providence.org> and <providencehealthplan.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 3, 2025. At the time of the Complaint and of this Decision, it resolved to a website with the headline "PROVIDENCEHEALTHCARE.AI" stating "Launching Soon" above fields inviting Internet users to enter their contact information.

The record indicates that the Respondent's organization is called "Providence Health Solutions". The Respondent email signature block in the record displays a tagline stating "Providing Intelligent LTC Solutions."

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 it operates one of the largest healthcare systems in the United States, with 125,000 caregivers in 51 hospitals and over 1,014 clinics across five states. Its PROVIDENCE and PROVIDENCE HEALTH PLAN marks have been in use for many years and thereby has acquired significant goodwill in these marks. The disputed domain name incorporates the PROVIDENCE mark in its entirety, together with generic terms that cause confusion among members of the public. The disputed domain name resolves to a landing website that falsely suggests that the Respondent is the Complainant or affiliated with it, contrary to the fact that the Respondent is unrelated to the Complainant. The disputed domain name is being warehoused in bad faith.

The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions. In an email communication to the Center on July 1, 2026, the Respondent stated that it was copied on the correspondence concerning these proceedings but had not received a copy of the Complaint, which it thereby requested. The Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint and the proceedings commenced on July 10, 2026, but the Respondent did not reply to the Complaint.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the UDRP requires the Complainant to make out all three 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 Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Under paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, “[a] Panel shall 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”.

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 Complainant's PROVIDENCE 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, “healthcare,”) 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.

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.

In particular, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name reflects the entirety of the Complainant's PROVIDENCE mark, followed by the term "healthcare" and "partner", indicating an affiliation with the Complainant. Such a composition, on balance, signals an intention on the part of the Respondent to mislead Internet users into believing the disputed domain name is operated by the Complainant and cannot lead to a finding that the Respondent has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

The Panel does not find that the record supports a finding that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or is making legitimate noncommercial use of it. The record indicates that the disputed domain name resolves to a landing page displaying the terms "PROVIDENCEHEALTHCARE.AI" and "Launching Soon". The Respondent, which has identified itself as "Providence Healthcare Solutions" has not provided any information regarding its activities and has not rebutted the Complainant's contention that the Respondent has no authorization to use the PROVIDENCE mark in a domain name or in any other way.

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 finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. The Complainant's rights in the PROVIDENCE and PROVIDENCE HEALTH PLAN marks predate the registration of the disputed domain name by several years. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's assertion that its PROVIDENCE mark has been used in connection with healthcare services for more than a century. The inherently misleading disputed domain name contains the Complainant's established PROVIDENCE mark together with the term "healthcare", which creates a risk of confusion. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

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.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To 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 long use of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, 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 <providencehealthcare.ai> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa/

Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa

Sole Panelist

Date: August 26, 2026