

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

EISAI R&D Management, Co., Ltd. v. Domain Admin
Case No. DCO2026-0058

1. The Parties

The Complainant is EISAI R&D Management, Co., Ltd., Japan, represented by IP Twins SAS, France.

The Respondent is Domain Admin, Panama.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <eisai.co> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) 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 July 30, 2026. On July 30, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On August 3, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 6, 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 amended Complaint on August 6, 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 August 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 27, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 31, 2026.

The Center appointed Mariia Koval as the sole panelist in this matter on September 9, 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 global pharmaceutical company engaged in research and development, manufacture, sale, import and export of pharmaceuticals through its group companies and operations worldwide. As of March 2026, the Complainant employs over 10,000 staff on a consolidated basis. The Complainant has marketing operations in more than 40 subsidiaries worldwide. The Complainant's group reported annual revenue of JPY 825.4 billion in fiscal year 2025.

The Complainant is the owner of a number of EISAI trademark registrations (the "EISAI Trademark") throughout the world, among which are:

- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00000941924, registered on April 30, 1969, in respect of goods in class 5;
- United States of America Trademark Registration No. 2212335, registered on December 22, 1998, in respect of goods in classes 5 and 9;
- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 003488137, registered on April 12, 2005, in respect of goods and services in classes 5, 9 and 44.

The Complainant's group of companies operates, among others, the domain names <eisai.com>, <eisai.eu>, <eisai.de> and others, reflecting its EISAI Trademark for promoting its products and services.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on September 20, 2013. As at the date of filing of the Complaint the Disputed Domain Name redirects to another website displaying a CAPTCHA verification; upon completion of this verification, a security warning alert is displayed. Prior to the filing of the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name was used in connection with a series of redirects, some of which directed Internet users to potentially malicious webpages (Annex 7 to the Complaint). Moreover, the Disputed Domain Name is offered for sale through the "www.sedo.com" platform (Annex 8 to the Complaint).

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 identical to the Complainant's EISAI Trademark since the Disputed Domain Name reproduces the Complainant's EISAI Trademark in its entirety.

The Complainant further claims that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name in view of the following:

- the Respondent has acquired no trademark in EISAI which could have granted the Respondent rights in the Disputed Domain Name;
- there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name as an individual, business, or other organization;

- the Respondent reproduces the Complainant's earlier registered EISAI Trademark in the Disputed Domain Name without any license or authorization from the Complainant;
- the Complainant puts forth that the Respondent has not, before the original filing of the Complaint, used or made preparations to use the Disputed Domain Name in relation to a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, the Disputed Domain Name is being used through a set of various redirections, some of which direct to malicious pages;
- the Disputed Domain Name is offered for sale at a price exceeding out-of-pocket costs.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith based on the following. The Respondent's choice of the Disputed Domain Name cannot have been accidental and must have been influenced by the fame of the Complainant and its earlier EISAI Trademark. The Complainant submits that it is highly likely that the Respondent chose the Disputed Domain Name because of its similarity to the EISAI Trademark in which the Complainant has rights and legitimate interests. The Complainant's EISAI Trademark registrations significantly predate the registration date of the Disputed Domain Name. A quick trademark search would have revealed to the Respondent the existence of the Complainant and its EISAI Trademark.

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent's current use of the Disputed Domain Name may not be considered good faith use. By simply maintaining the Disputed Domain Name, the Respondent is preventing the Complainant from reflecting its EISAI Trademark in the corresponding domain name. Moreover, the Disputed Domain Name is offered for sale at a price that would exceed the Respondent's out-of-pocket costs directly associated with the Disputed Domain Name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, a complainant, to succeed, 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 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 Disputed Domain Name completely reproduces the Complainant's EISAI Trademark in combination with the country-code Top-Level domain ("ccTLD") ".co". Pursuant to section 1.7 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, the domain name will normally be considered identical or confusingly similar to that mark for purposes of UDRP standing. The Respondent's

incorporation of the Complainant's EISAI Trademark in full in the Disputed Domain Name is evidence that the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the Complainant's Trademark.

The ccTLD of the Disputed Domain Name, in this case ".co", is viewed as a standard registration requirement and is as such disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the Complainant's EISAI Trademark pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy and 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 Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or permitted the Respondent to register or use the Disputed Domain Name or to use the EISAI Trademark nor is there any other evidence in the file suggesting that the Respondent has or could have rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

The composition of the Disputed Domain Name – being identical to the mark – carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1). The Panel is of the opinion that the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name. As of the date of this Decision, the Disputed Domain Name redirects to another website where after completing the CAPTCHA verification the security warning alert appears. At the date of filing of the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name was used in connection with a series of redirects, some of which directed Internet users to potentially malicious webpages. In pursuance of [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1, "Panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (e.g., the sale of counterfeit goods or illegal pharmaceuticals, phishing, distributing malware, unauthorized account access/hacking, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent." With respect to the circumstances of this case, the Panel considers that the circumstances of the case indicate that the Disputed Domain Name is being used in a manner that seeks to take advantage of the Complainant's EISAI Trademark and the resulting association with the Complainant. Such use cannot confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

Moreover, the Disputed Domain Name is offered for sale through the website "www.sedo.com", which could not be considered a bona fide offering of goods/services or justifying rights and legitimate interests on behalf of the Respondent.

The Respondent has not submitted any response and has not claimed any such rights or legitimate interests with respect to the Disputed Domain Name. In addition, the Respondent did not demonstrate 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.

In view of the foregoing, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name and that the Complainant succeeds under the second element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

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 concludes that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith in view of the following. The Complainant obtained the registration of the EISAI Trademark more than 50 years earlier than the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name in 2013. Taking into account all circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that the Respondent was very well aware of the Complainant's EISAI Trademark when registering the identical Disputed Domain Name that completely incorporates the Complainant's EISAI Trademark. The Panel considers it is obviously bad faith that the Respondent deliberately chose the Disputed Domain Name to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's EISAI Trademark.

At the date of this Decision, when accessed by the Panel, the Disputed Domain Name redirects to another website displaying a CAPTCHA verification; upon completion of this verification, a security warning alert is displayed. The Complainant also provided evidence that the Disputed Domain Name previously redirected to different webpages, some of which directed Internet users to potentially malicious webpages. Moreover, the Disputed Domain Name is offered for sale through the "www.sedo.com" platform. The Panel concludes that the Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name to redirect to third-party pages and further offering it for sale, is evidence of bad faith registration and use. Furthermore, the underlying beneficial registrant's use of a proxy service to conceal its true identity further evidences bad faith registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name under the circumstances of this case.

Furthermore, prior UDRP panels have recognized that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can itself create a presumption of bad faith (see section 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), which states that "the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain name comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith"). Based on the evidence submitted by the Complainant concerning the longstanding use and extensive geographical presence of its prior EISAI Trademark, and it has been stated above that the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the EISAI Trademark, the Panel considers that the Respondent was more likely than not aware of the Complainant and its widely-known EISAI Trademark when registering the Disputed Domain Name. These circumstances, together with the manner in which the Disputed Domain Name has been used, support a finding that the Respondent registered and has used the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

The Panel also notes that the Respondent has not submitted any response in this proceeding to show its motivations and justifications in the registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name, and it has not rebutted the Complainant's assertions on registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

In view of the foregoing, the Panel finds that paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy has been satisfied by the Complainant and accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 <eisai.co> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mariia Koval/

Mariia Koval

Sole Panelist

Date: September 23, 2026