

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Limited, IVAX International B.V. v.
Qingqing Ren
Case No. DCO2025-0063

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Limited, Israel and IVAX International B.V., Netherlands (Kingdom of the), represented by SILKA AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Qingqing Ren, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <tevadigihaler.co> is registered with Dominet (HK) Limited (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 31, 2025. On July 31, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 4, 2025, 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”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 5, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 25, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 27, 2025.

The Center appointed Olga Zalomiy as the sole panelist in this matter on August 28, 2025. 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 IVAX International B.V. has become a wholly owned subsidiary of the Complainant Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Limited since 2006. IVAX International B.V. owns the DIGIHALER marks while Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Limited owns the TEVA marks. IVAX International B.V. and Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Limited are hereinafter together referred to as “the Complainant”. The Complainant is a global pharmaceutical company. The Complainant has an online presence through the domain name <tevadigihaler.co.uk> (registered in 2022), which displays information about the Complainant and its DIGIHALER-branded products.

The Complainant owns a number of trademark registrations for the TEVA and DIGIHALER marks (the “Trademarks”), such as:

- United Kingdom trademark No. UK00001369112 for the TEVA mark (word), registered on August 17, 1990;
- European Union trademark No. 015743172 for the DIGIHALER mark (word), registered on January 9, 2017; and
- United States of America trademark No. 1567918 for the TEVA mark (word), registered on November 28, 1989.

Prior UDRP panels have found the Complainant’s TEVA trademark well-known.¹

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on July 2, 2025. The disputed domain name directs to a landing page that displays the following statements: “the domain name Tevadigihaler.co is for sale” and another statement: “Get this domain. Pay the full \$1,450 now to make it yours!”.

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 is confusingly similar to its Trademarks, as it incorporates the Trademarks in their entirety. The Complainant argues that the country code Top-Level Domain (“ccTLD”) “.co” should be disregarded under the confusing similarity test as it is a standard registration requirement.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because (i) the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant and has not received any consent or authorization to use the Complainant’s Trademarks in connection with the registration of the disputed domain name; (ii) the disputed domain name and the term “tevadigihaler” have no meaning in the English language; (iii) the Complainant found nothing to suggest that the Respondent owns any trademarks in the term “tevadigihaler”; and (iv) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name; (v) the Respondent has not used, nor prepared to use, the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services or for a legitimate noncommercial purposes because the disputed domain name resolves to a GoDaddy parking page, where it is listed for sale at USD 1,450 and because its composition suggests affiliation with the Complainant.

¹ *Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd. v. mike franco*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-3859](#); *TEVA Pharmaceutical Industries Limited v. 杨智超 (Zhi Chao Yang)*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-2364](#); *Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Limited v. Amal Mhah, New teva pharma, Domain Admin, Privacy Protect, LLC (PrivacyProtect.org) / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0561](#).

The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, because the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's well-known TEVA mark and its DIGIHALER mark in their entirety without consent of the Complainant. The Complainant argues that it is implausible the Respondent was unaware of the Trademarks when it registered the disputed domain name. The Complainant states that considering the composition of the disputed domain name that Internet users commonly associate with the Complainant, it is likely that the Respondent chose the disputed domain name with the Trademark's in mind. The Complainant contends that the mere registration of the disputed domain name that is confusingly similar to a well-known mark by an unaffiliated entity, like the Respondent, indicates bad faith. The Complainant argues that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in bad faith because it resolves to a GoDaddy parking page, where the disputed domain name is offered for sale for USD 1,450, which indicates that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name to sell it to the Complainant or to a competitor for an amount likely in excess of the Respondent's out-of-pocket costs, which constitutes registration and use in bad faith. The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name has active Mail Exchange ("MX") records, which may be used for phishing activities.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Issue: Consolidation

The Complainant IVAX International B.V. and the Complainant Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Limited filed a joint Complaint against the Respondent and requested consolidation of their disputes against the Respondent. Multiple complainants may file a single complaint against a respondent if the complainants establish that: "(i) the complainants have a specific common grievance against the respondent, or the respondent has engaged in common conduct that has affected the complainants in a similar fashion, and (ii) it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to permit the consolidation." WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.11.1.

Here, the Complainant IVAX International B.V. is a wholly owned subsidiary of the Complainant Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Limited. The Complainant Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Limited owns the TEVA trademark, while the Complainant IVAX International B.V. owns the DIGIHALER trademark. The Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name, which incorporates both Trademarks. Therefore, the Respondent's actions have impacted both Complainants giving rise to a shared grievance. Allowing consolidation is equitable and promotes procedural efficiency. Moreover, the Respondent, despite having ample opportunity, did not object to the consolidation or demonstrate any potential prejudice it might suffer as a result. Therefore, the Panel concludes that consolidation is appropriate in this case.

6.2. Substantive Issues

Pursuant to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed in this proceeding, the Complainant must prove each of the following elements 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 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 trademarks and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Trademarks is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. The inclusion of the ccTLD ".co" is disregarded in the context of the confusing similarity assessment, being a technical requirement of registration. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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 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 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 3.0](#), 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 evidence on record shows that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor has it been authorized by the Complainant to use the Complainant's distinctive trademark in a domain name. The Respondent is making neither legitimate noncommercial use of the disputed domain name, nor is the Respondent using it for a bona fide offering of goods or services. Instead, the disputed domain name, which incorporates the Complainant's well-known TEVA and DIGIHALER trademarks, resolves to a parking page where it is listed for sale at USD 1,450.

Furthermore, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name, consisting of the Complainant's Trademarks, carries a risk of implied affiliation because it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

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 a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant's well-known TEVA and DIGIHALER trademarks many years after the Complainant's first trademark registration. The disputed domain name does not only incorporate the Trademarks but is also confusingly similar to the Complainant's domain name <tevadigihaler.co.uk>. Considering the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and the absence of a credible explanation for choosing the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

The disputed domain name resolves to a GoDaddy parking page on which it is offered for sale for USD 1,450. This is most likely in excess of the Respondent's out-of-pocket costs of the registration of the disputed domain name and the Respondent has not contested this. The Respondent has therefore registered the disputed domain name presumably for the purpose of selling the disputed domain name to the Complainant, who is the owner of the Trademarks or to a competitor of the Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's out-of-pocket costs related to the disputed domain name. Such conduct constitutes bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(i) of 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 <tevadigihaler.co> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Olga Zalomiy/

Olga Zalomiy

Sole Panelist

Date: September 11, 2025