



URS | DETERMINATION
(URS Procedure 9, URS Rules 13)

URS DISPUTE NO. 5B5FA1D4

Determination DEFAULT

I. PARTIES

Complainant: BIOFARMA (France)

Complainant's authorized representative: IP Twins (France)

Respondents: Domain Admin (Australia), Aleksei Varaksin (Russian Federation)

II. THE DOMAIN NAME, REGISTRY OPERATOR AND REGISTRAR

Domain Names: coverlam.pro, coverlam.shop, coverlam.site

Registry Operator: CentralNic Ltd, Identity Digital Technical Support, GMO Registry

Registrar: REG.RU, LLC

III. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Complaint submitted: 27 October 2025

Lock of the domain name: 30 October 2025

Notice of Complaint: 22 November 2025

Default Date: 6 December 2025

Notice of Default: 13 December 2025

Panel Appointed: 15 December 2025

Default Determination issued: 17 December

IV. EXAMINER

Examiner's Name: Igor Motsnyi

The Examiner certifies that he has acted independently and impartially and to the best of his knowledge has no known conflict in serving as the Examiner in this administrative proceeding.

V. RELIEF SOUGHT

The Complainant requests that the domain name be suspended for the balance of the registration period.

The Respondent has not submitted a Response.

VI. STANDARD OF REVIEW

Clear and convincing evidence.

VII. DISCUSSIONS AND FINDINGS

A. Complainant:

Preliminary matter: consolidation

The Complainant requests consolidation of this dispute in respect of all three (3) disputed domain names and the named Respondents based on the following:

- all three disputed domain names have been registered on the same day with the same Registrar and
- the Complainant claims that this is sufficient to establish that the three disputed domain names are under common control, and a single complaint is justified.

1. The Complainant states that it is a part of the Servier Group: the largest French pharmaceutical group on an independent level and the second largest pharmaceutical French group in the world. The group is active in 150 countries and employs more than 21,000 people throughout the world. The Complainant owns various “COVERLAM” trademark registrations throughout the world. The Complainant submits that its “COVERLAM” trademark is an arbitrary mark in relation to pharmaceutical products. The Complainant’s registered word trademarks predate the date of Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain names.

2. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no legitimate right or interest to the disputed domain names and that it made a *prima facie* case that the Respondent lacks legitimate rights or legitimate interests.

The disputed domain names are not used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services: they all resolve to parking pages.

The Respondent is not known, as an individual or an organization, by the disputed domain names and holds no trademark rights in the term “COVERLAM”. The Complainant claims that there is no recorded owner of “COVERLAM” trademarks in Russia. The Respondent has never been authorized by the Complainant to use its earlier trademarks in the disputed domain names. The Complainant and the Respondent have no contractual or business relationships.

3. The Complainant submits that the Respondent knew or should have known of the existence of the Complainant when it registered the disputed domain names. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain names reproduce the arbitrary trademark “COVERLAM” and a likelihood of confusion is presumed.

The Complainant believes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names and is holding them primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the disputed domain names to the Complainant or to a competitor of the Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain names.

The Respondent also submits that by holding the disputed domain names, the Respondent prevents the Complainant to register these and use them in association with web content



related to its trademark “COVERLAM”. The registration of the three disputed domain names by the Respondent is an indication of a pattern of conduct consisting in the registration of batches of several domains identical to third-party-held prior trademarks.

B. Respondent:

The Respondent did not submit a Response.

C. Procedural findings:

Consolidation

The Complainant requested consolidation of the proceedings in respect of all three disputed domain names and the named Respondents into a single proceeding.

Under sec. 4.11.2 of “[WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition](#)” (“WIPO Overview 3.0), that can be applicable to URS disputes as well, in considering consolidation scenario, panels look at whether (i) the domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control, and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties.

The Examiner agrees with the Complainant’s arguments that all three disputed domain names appear to be under common control, they all follow the same naming pattern, they were all registered on the same day, July 24, 2025 with the same Registrar and they all resolve to similar parking pages.

The Examiner notes that in one of the recent URS determinations, another Examiner followed the same reasoning and accepted consolidation, see [URS DISPUTE NO. 2679F794](#).

The Examiner therefore allows the Complaint to proceed on a consolidated basis and will refer to the Respondent in singular form.

Having reviewed the communications records, the Examiner finds that MFSD has discharged its responsibility under the URS Procedure paragraphs 3 and 4 and URS Rules paragraph 4. In accordance with URS Rules Paragraph 9(d), in absence of a Response, the language of the Determination shall be English.

D. Findings of fact:

The disputed domain names were registered on July 24, 2025.

The disputed domain names resolve to parking pages of the Registrar stating that “the Domain is registered and parked with Reg.ru”.

There is no evidence on record of any active use of the disputed domain names or any evidence that would indicate that the disputed domain name were ever offered for sale to the Complainant or its competitor.

The Complainant relies on the following word trademark registrations “COVERLAM”:

- French trademark registration “COVERLAM” No. 3466112, registered on May 4, 2007;
- EU trademark registration “COVERLAM” No. 005612577, registered on October 01, 2007 and

- UK trademark registration “COVERLAM” No. UK00905612577, registered on October 1, 2007.

The Complainant provided evidence that its word trademarks are in use in relation to pharmaceutical preparations (including pictures of products’ packaging with the “COVERLAM” trademark).

E. Reasoning:

1. The domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a word mark

The Complainant has provided proof of its registered word trademarks “COVERLAM” in France, the EU and the UK and proof of use of its trademark.

Therefore, the Complainant proved its trademark rights and that its word trademarks are in use.

The disputed domain names contain the mark in its entirety without any other additional elements plus the gTLDs.

The Examiner agrees with the view expressed in WIPO Overview 3.0 that the test “*for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the complainant’s trademark and the disputed domain name*” (sec. 1.7).

Based on the above, the Examiner finds that the disputed domain names are identical with the Complainant’s word trademarks.

The gTLDs do not affect finding that the disputed domain names are identical to the Complainant’s mark.

The Examiner finds that the requirements set forth under Paragraph 1.2.6.1. of the URS Procedure have been satisfied.

2. Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests to the disputed domain names

The Complainant is required to make out a *prima facie* case that the Respondent lacks legitimate right or interest; and once such *prima facie* case is made, the burden shifts to the Respondent who has to demonstrate his/her legitimate right or interest.

The Complainant has made a *prima facie* case. The Respondent has failed to respond.

The Respondent is not authorized by the Complainant to use its trademarks in the disputed domain names and the Respondent is not known by the disputed domain names.

There is no evidence on record that would demonstrate any legitimate right or interest of the Respondent in respect of the disputed domain names.

Based on the above, the Examiner finds that the Respondent lacks any legitimate right or legitimate interest with respect to the disputed domain names as per the requirements set forth under Paragraph 1.2.6.2. of the URS Procedure.

3. The domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith

The Examiner finds that the Complainant failed to establish the third URS element by clear and convincing evidence.

First, the Examiner notes that the URS Procedure provides that the burden of proof shall be clear and convincing evidence (see paragraph 8.2 of URS Procedure) and that the



Complainant must present evidence that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Under paragraph 8.6 of URS Procedure, if the Examiner finds that all three standards are satisfied by clear and convincing evidence and that there is no genuine contestable issue, then the Examiner shall issue a Determination in favor of the Complainant. At the same time, under paragraph 8.4 of the URS Procedure, if the Examiner finds that the Complainant has not met its burden, or that genuine issues of material fact remain in regards to any of the elements, the Examiner will reject the Complaint under the relief available under the URS.

Second, turning to the facts and evidence of the present dispute, the Examiner observes that the disputed domain names resolve to Registrar parking pages, there is no evidence of active use of the disputed domain name (e.g. use for impersonation of the Complainant or any other illegal activity) and there is no evidence that the disputed domain names were offered for sale to the Complainant or its competitor.

The fact that the Respondent registered the three disputed domain names *per se* does not establish that the disputed domain names were registered keeping the Complainant and its trademark in mind. There is no evidence that the Respondent's motivation in registering the disputed domain names was "to prevent the Complainant" from reflecting its mark in corresponding domain names.

The Complainant itself provided various "COVERLAM" trademark registrations in the world as annex 8 to its complaint. Many of such trademark registrations are owned by holders unrelated to the Complainant and the Complainant does not appear to be the only or even the predominant owner of "COVERLAM" mark.

There is also no evidence on record that the Complainant's "COVERLAM" mark is widely known or famous.

The URS is not intended for use in any proceedings with open questions of fact, but only for clear cases of trademark abuse. The Examiner does not find that evidence on record establishes that this case is a clear case of trademark abuse.

Under paragraph 8.6 of the URS Procedure, if the Examiner finds that any of the standards have not been satisfied, then the Examiner shall deny the relief requested, thereby terminating the URS proceeding without prejudice to the Complainant to proceed with an action in court of competent jurisdiction or under the UDRP.

The Examiner denies the relief without prejudice to the Complainant to proceed with any other actions as described above.

In these circumstances, the Examiner finds that the requirements of Paragraph 1.2.6.3. of the URS Procedure have not been satisfied.

4. Abusive Complaint

The Examiner finds that the Complaint was neither abusive nor contained material falsehoods.

VIII. DETERMINATION

A. Demonstration of URS elements

Not demonstrated

B. Complaint and remedy

Complaint: Rejects

Domain Names: coverlam.pro, coverlam.shop, coverlam.site

Unlock and return to the full control of the Registrant

C. Abuse of proceedings

Finding of abuse of proceedings: Not finds

D. Publication

Publication: Publish the Determination

SIGNATURE

Name: Igor

Surname: Motsnyi

Date: 2025-12-17