

PANEL DECISION

Celltrion Holdings Co., Ltd., Celltrion Healthcare Hungary Kft. v. Maurizio Guglielmino

Case No. DEU2025-0031

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Celltrion Holdings Co., Ltd., Republic of Korea, and Celltrion Healthcare Hungary Kft., Hungary, represented by SILKA AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Maurizio Guglielmino, Italy.

2. The Domain Name, Registry and Registrar

The Registry of the disputed domain name <celtrion.eu> is the European Registry for Internet Domains ("EURid" or the "Registry"). The Registrar of the disputed domain name is Spaceship, Inc.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on December 3, 2025. On December 3, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registry a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 5, 2025, the Registry 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 .eu Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules (the "ADR Rules") and the World Intellectual Property Organization Supplemental Rules for .eu Alternative Dispute Resolution Rules (the "Supplemental Rules").

In accordance with the ADR Rules, Paragraph B(2), the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 12, 2025. In accordance with the ADR Rules, Paragraph B(3), the due date for Response was January 1, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on January 6, 2026.

The Center appointed Alfred Meijboom as the sole panelist in this matter on January 13, 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 ADR Rules, Paragraph B(5).

4. Factual Background

The first Complainant, Celltrion Holdings Co., Ltd., is the holding company of the Celltrion Group which is a global integrated biotechnology company involved in the research, development and production of biosimilar, biodrugs, and chemical drugs. The first Complainant is one of the largest manufacturer and exporter of biosimilars in the Republic of Korea. The first Complainant has more than 2,000 employees and a global distribution network with goods available in over 100 countries around the world.

The first Complainant is the owner of registered trademarks for CELLTRION in many jurisdictions, including the following International registrations which designate the European Union:

- International trademark CELLTRION with registration number 1030013 of November 10, 2009, for goods and services in classes 5, 35, 40, 42, and 44;
- International trademark CELLTRION with registration number 1565350 of October 27, 2020, for goods in class 10; and
- International trademark CELLTRION with registration number 1565361 of October 27, 2020, for goods in class 29.

The second Complainant, Celltrion Healthcare Hungary Kft., is an affiliate of the Celltrion Group which is established in the European Union and distributed “celltrion” products in Hungary.

In addition to its primary global website under the domain name <celltrion.com> which was registered in February 2002, the Celltrion Group maintains a strategic portfolio of domain names incorporating the CELLTRION trademark, tailored to key regional markets, including across the European Union. Notably, this includes dedicated country-specific websites which are actively used to promote the Celltrion Group products and services within the European Union, including those under the domain names <celltrionhealthcare.it>, <celltrionhealthcare.hu>, <celltrionhealthcare.fr>, <celltrionhealthcare.nl>, and <celltrionhealthcare.de>.

The disputed domain name was registered on August 20, 2025, and initially resolved to a website which purported to offer pool maintenance and repair services. This website contained a fictitious telephone number and an email address belonging to a small business in the United States of America, which the Complainants allege has no connection to the Respondent, and that there is no clear link between the Respondent and the website to which the disputed domain name resolved to. Subsequently, the disputed domain name (via a browser privacy warning caused by an SSL certificate mismatch) resolved to a cloned copy of a website with gambling-related articles. As with the earlier pool-service contents, the Complainants allege that there is no logical or linguistic connection between “celtrion” and the gambling content, nor is there any evidence of an actual business associated with the Respondent.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the ADR Rules for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainants contend that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the first Complainant’s CELLTRION trademarks as it includes the CELLTRION trademark in its entirety, the only difference being the omission of an “I”.

The Complainants allege that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name as to the Complainants' knowledge, the Respondent does not have trademark rights for, nor is it commonly known by, "celtrion" or any similar term. According to the Complainants the Respondent is not connected to nor affiliated with the Complainants and has not received a license or consent to use the CELLTRION (or any associated) trademarks in any way. The Complainants further allege that the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with an actual offering of goods or services, nor made demonstrable preparations to do so. Nor is the Respondent making a legitimate and non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent to mislead. The Complainants also allege that the disputed domain name is a typosquatting variation of the CELLTRION trademark and therefore carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainants and the CELLTRION trademark.

According to the Complainants the registration of the disputed domain name was made in bad faith because the CELLTRION trademarks are well established in the European Union and it is clear that even a minimal degree of due diligence would have made any prospective registrant of the disputed domain name aware of the first Complainant's rights in the CELLTRION trademarks, including in the European Union. This is especially so as the slight typographical variation of the disputed domain name vis-à-vis the CELLTRION trademark preserves the overall appearance, structure, and pronunciation of the trademark, making the difference easily overlooked by users, especially when typed quickly or viewed at a glance. The Complainants also point out that the term "celtrion" has no independent meaning, nor any logical connection to either of the Respondent's purported uses of the disputed domain name.

The Complainants also allege that the use of the disputed domain name is made in bad faith because the disputed domain name has hosted two unrelated and manifestly pretextual websites – first a fabricated pool maintenance business displaying a fictitious phone number and a misappropriated third-party email address, and subsequently a cloned copy of an unrelated gambling website, served through a misconfigured SSL certificate that triggers browser security warnings. According to the Complainants the combination of deceptive content, technical misconfiguration, and a domain name that imitates a well-established brand also creates a latent risk that the disputed domain name could be repurposed for phishing or other harmful activity in the future.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainants' contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Procedural Matters

The Complaint was filed by two Complainants, the first Complainant being the holding company of the Celltrion Group and the owner of the CELLTRION trademarks, and the second Complainant being the Hungarian affiliate of the Celltrion Group. Article 4(6) of Regulation (EU) 2019/517 states that "[d]omain names registered under the .eu [Top Level Domain ("TLD")] shall be transferable only to parties eligible for registration of .eu TLD names", and Article 3 of Regulation (EU) 2019/517 provides that "[r]egistration of one or more domain names under the .eu TLD can be requested by any of the following: [...] (c) an undertaking that is established in the Union". The second Complainant is established in the European Union Member State Hungary and therefore satisfies such general eligibility criteria. As it is undisputed that the second Complainant is an affiliate of the Celltrion Group and distributes CELLTRION products in at least Hungary, both Complainants have an interest in the requested transfer of the disputed domain name and it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to permit the consolidation of the Complaint (e.g., *Helinox Inc. and Helinox Europe B.V. v. Helinox Development*, WIPO Case No. DEU2018-0001). Consequently, the Panel accepts the Complainants jointly filing the Complaint.

The Respondent did not file a Response. In this respect, paragraph B(10)(a) of the ADR Rules states that “the Panel shall proceed to a decision on the Complaint and may consider this failure to comply as grounds to accept the claims of the other Party”, and paragraph B(10)(b) of the ADR Rules states that “the Panel shall draw such inferences therefrom as it considers appropriate”. As set out in section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”),¹ the consensus view of UDRP panels is that the respondent’s default does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the complainant.

In order to succeed in its Complaint, the Complainants are required under paragraph B(11)(d)(1) of the ADR Rules to demonstrate the following:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a name in respect of which a right is recognised or established by the national law of a Member State and/or European Union law; and *either*
- (ii) the disputed domain name has been registered by the Respondent without rights or legitimate interest in the name; *or*
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith.

B. Identical or Confusingly Similar to a name in respect of which a right or rights are recognized or established by national law of a Member State and/or European Union law

The Complainants have shown that the CELLTRION trademarks consist of rights which are recognized by the national law of a European Union Member State for the purposes of the ADR Rules.

As the entire CELLTRION trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, with the omission of a letter “l”, and the TLD “.eu” is to be ignored in the assessment of the first element of paragraph B(11)(d) of the ADR Rules (e.g., *ELO v. Bum Lup*, WIPO Case No. [DEU2024-0011](#)), the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the CELLTRION trademark for the purposes of the ADR Rules. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Complainants have satisfied the requirement of the first element of paragraph B(11)(d)(1) of the ADR Rules.

C. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph B(11)(e) of the ADR Rules provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights to or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in proceedings under the ADR Rules 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 of paragraph B(11)(d)(1) of the ADR Rules (e.g., *A.S. Watson (Health & Beauty Continental Europe), B.V. v. Meike De Jong*, WIPO Case No. [DEU2023-0036](#); *Etablissements Sogal v. Patrice Beaut*, WIPO Case No. [DEU2023-0047](#)).

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainants have established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainants’ 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

¹ Noting the similarities between the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “UDRP”) and the ADR Rules, the Panel shall refer to prior UDRP cases and the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), where appropriate.

ADR Rules or otherwise.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of paragraph B(11)(d)(1) of the ADR Rules has been established.

D. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

For completeness' sake the Panel has also reviewed the requirement of bad faith registration or use, although under the ADR Rules it is sufficient that a complainant, as in this case, proves the first two elements of paragraph B(11)(d)(1) of the ADR Rules.

Pursuant to paragraph B(11)(f)(4) of the ADR Rules, there is evidence of registration or use of the disputed domain name in bad faith where there are circumstances indicating that the disputed domain name was intentionally used to attract Internet users, for commercial gain to the Respondent's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with a name in respect of which a right is recognised or established by national and/or European Union law, with such likelihood arising as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website or location or of a product or service on the website or location of the Respondent. It is undisputed that the CELLTRION trademark was registered more than 15 years prior to the registration of the disputed domain name, is well established in the European Union, and has no specific dictionary meaning, while the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the CELLTRION trademark, reproducing the CELLTRION trademark except for the omission of a letter "l", from which the Panel infers that, without a plausible explanation from the Respondent, which is lacking, it is reasonable to assume that the Respondent was aware of the CELLTRION trademark when it registered the disputed domain name. Therefore, the Panel finds that the registration was made in bad faith, and the third element of paragraph B(11)(d)(1) of the ADR Rules has been established.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with Paragraph B(11) of the ADR Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <celtrion.eu> be transferred to Celltrion Healthcare Hungary Kft.²

/Alfred Meijboom/

Alfred Meijboom

Sole Panelist

Date: January 20, 2026

² The remedy sought by the Complainants is the transfer of the disputed domain name to the second Complainant, Celltrion Healthcare Hungary Kft. As the second Complainant is established in Hungary, which is a Member State of the European Union, it satisfies the general eligibility criteria for registration of the disputed domain name set out in Article 3 of Regulation (EU) 2019/517. The decision shall be implemented by the Registry within thirty (30) days after the notification of the decision to the Parties, unless the Respondent initiates court proceedings in a Mutual Jurisdiction, as defined in Paragraph A(1) of the ADR Rules.