

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Norton (Waterford) Limited v. Qingqing Ren  
Case No. DCO2025-0077

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Norton (Waterford) Limited, Ireland, represented by SILKA AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Qingqing Ren, China.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <duoresp.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 September 17, 2025. On September 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 18, 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 September 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 14, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 15, 2025.

The Center appointed Manuel Moreno-Torres as the sole panelist in this matter on October 22, 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 is a subsidiary of Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Ltd., doing business internationally in the pharmaceutical sector with a portfolio of approximately 3,500 products.

The Complainant is the owner of a number of DUORESP trademarks in different jurisdictions. By way of example:

European Union Intellectual Property Office with registration number 009655952, registered on June 21, 2011.

Instituto Mexicano de la Propiedad Industrial with registration number 1336402, registered on December 4, 2012.

China National Intellectual Property Administration with registration number 11301470, registered on December 28, 2013.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 2, 2025 and has been used only to redirect internet users to a marketplace page where it is offered for sale for the sum of USD 1,450.

The Respondent has been involved in other UDRP cases, where the panels ordered the transfer of the corresponding domain names. As such, *Teva Pharmaceutical Industries Limited, IVAX International B.V. v. Qingqing Ren*, WIPO Case No. [DCO2025-0063](#) and *Carrefour SA, Atacadão S.A. v. Qingqing Ren*, WIPO Case No. [DCO2025-0053](#).

#### 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 contains DUORESP in full and that none of the scenarios describe in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy confers rights in favor to the Respondent. Further, the Respondent cannot credibly claim to have been unaware of the Complainant's rights when registering the disputed domain name since the Complainant is an affiliate of Teva Group, one of world's largest pharmaceutical companies.

The Complainant also alleges that the disputed domain name carries a high risk of implied affiliation.

Moreover, the Complainant asserts that the attempt to sell the disputed domain name for the sum of USD 1,450 falls within the circumstances of paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

##### B. Respondent

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

## 6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed the Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (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 was 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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[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 mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 Panel accepts the Complainant's allegation that none of the scenarios in paragraph 4 (c) of the Policy applies in this case.

The Panel looks at [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.: "UDRP panels have found that domain names identical to a complainant's trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation." Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name cannot confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent.

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's intent was to register the disputed domain name for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the Complainant or to one of its competitors for valuable consideration. That is to say, the circumstances of the case match with paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

Besides, the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of trademark-abusive domain name registrations. This is to be deemed in bad faith registration as set up in paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy.

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 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

The Respondent knew or should have known about the Complainant and its trademarks when registering the disputed domain name due to their reputation and distinctiveness. Indeed, WIPO Case No. [DCO2025-0063](#) referenced above was between the Respondent and the Complainant's parent company and one of its affiliates. Thus, a previous knowledge of the Complainant and its trademarks seems plausible. Under these circumstances, the registration and use of the disputed domain name is to be considered in bad faith.

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 <duoresp.co> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Manuel Moreno-Torres/*

**Manuel Moreno-Torres**

Sole Panelist

Date: November 6, 2025