

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

The Regents of the University of California v. Jeremy Corbett
Case No. D2026-1532

1. The Parties

Complainant is The Regents of the University of California, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Hanson Bridgett LLP, United States.

Respondent is Jeremy Corbett, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <ucsf.health> 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 April 10, 2026. On April 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 13, 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 (Registration Private / Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on April 14, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on April 17, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 12, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on May 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Frederick M. Abbott as the sole panelist in this matter on May 22, 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

Complainant is a corporation organized in the State of California, United States, with administrative offices in Oakland, California. Complainant is the governing body for the University of California system. This system includes the University of California, San Francisco campus customarily referred to as UCSF, and an associated healthcare center operating under the name UCSF HEALTH. Complainant governs UCSF HEALTH, which includes the UCSF Medical Center and UCSF Benioff Children's Hospital, plus a network of other hospitals and clinics in the San Francisco area. The University of California, San Francisco, has been operating under the UCSF name since the late 1960s. UCSF spent over USD1.7 billion on research and development in 2021 alone. Complainant provides information concerning UCSF HEALTH at the domain name <ucsfhealth.org>, and operates several other websites associated with UCSF, including at the domain name <ucsf.edu>. The <ucsf.edu> domain name was registered in 1986, and the <ucsfhealth.org> domain name was registered in 2000.

Complainant is the owner of registration for the word trademark and service mark UCSF on the Principal Register of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), registration number 4099127, registration dated February 14, 2012, in international classes (ICs) 6, 9, 16, 21, 25, 35, 41, 42 and 44, covering, inter alia, various education-related equipment and supplies, clothing, educational services, medical and scientific research, and medical clinics, as further specified. Complainant is also the owner of registration on the Principal Register of the USPTO for the trademark and service mark UCSF HEALTH, registration number 7158466, registration dated September 5, 2023 in ICs 6, 9, 16, 21, 25, 35, 41, 42 and 44, covering, inter alia, educational services, medical and scientific research, hospitals and medical clinics, telemedicine, and education related equipment and supplies, as further specified. Said registration disclaims the exclusive right to use the term HEALTH apart from the mark as shown. Complainant also is the owner of registration on the Principal Register of the USPTO for the word and design service mark UCSF HEALTH (described as "... the stylized letters UCSF with UC slightly above SF with the C and S connecting next to the word HEALTH"), registration number 7165240, registration dated September 12, 2023, in ICs 35, 41, 42 and 44, covering, inter alia, maintaining personal medical histories, educational services, medical and scientific research, hospital services and telemedicine, as further specified. Said registration disclaims the exclusive right to use the term HEALTH apart from the mark as shown.

According to the Registrar's verification, Respondent is registrant of the disputed domain name. According to the WhoIs report the disputed domain name was registered on January 1, 2019.

Respondent uses the disputed domain name to direct Internet users to a webpage hosted by "WeBrand", a template management and digital asset platform. The webpage solicits Internet users interested in acquiring the disputed domain name to provide contact information, suggesting that the user may "Increase brand authority in the healthcare space." It further states that Health domains are "perfect for" health systems and provider groups, wellness and fitness brands, national health associations and health-tech startups.

Complainant has provided the text of an email of August 14, 2025, from an individual (Nick Child), the email sender domain of which is linked to the WeBrand website, stating:

"Hope you're doing well. I'm reaching out because we own the domain UCSF.health. Our company acquired it as part of a broader portfolio acquisition within the health & wellness space and we are now trying to get these assets into the right hands. As ucsf.health has an obvious connection to your brand, I wanted to provide you with the first pass on acquiring it, before turning elsewhere. Please let us know if there is interest on that side in exploring further - happy to send details or jump on a 10-minute call."

The signature block of the aforesaid email refers to "WeBrand.Health"

There is no evidence on the record of this proceeding of an affiliation or association, commercial or otherwise, between Complainant and Respondent.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, Complainant contends that it owns rights in the trademarks UCSF and UCSF HEALTH and that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to those trademarks.

Complainant alleges that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because: (1) Respondent is not known by the trademark terms and could not have developed any common law rights in them; (2) Complainant has not licensed or otherwise permitted Respondent to use its trademarks in the disputed domain name or otherwise; (3) Respondent's conduct is prima facie evidence that it lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Complainant argues that Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith because: (1) Respondent has not offered any evidence that it used the disputed domain name for any legitimate or good-faith purpose; (2) Respondent has offered to sell the disputed domain name to Complainant or to a third party; (3) an Internet search for Respondent's name and town reveals he is a medical professional; (4) offering the disputed domain name on a parked page advertising it for sale evidences bad faith; and (5) registering the disputed domain name for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor is evidence of bad faith.

Complainant requests that the Panel direct the Registrar to transfer the disputed domain name to Complainant.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy sets forth three elements that must be established by a complainant to merit a finding that a respondent has engaged in abusive domain name registration and use and to obtain relief.

These elements are that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which complainant has rights;
- (ii) 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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of the trademarks¹ UCSF and UCSF HEALTH for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the marks is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Complainant's UCSF trademark is identical to the second level domain of the disputed domain name.² Complainant's UCSF HEALTH trademark is identical to the combination second level domain and ".health" TLD of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to each of Complainant's trademarks.

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 Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on Complainant, panels have recognized that proving that 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 Respondent. As such, where Complainant, as here, makes out a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on Complainant). If Respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, Complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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 only evidence of use by Respondent of the disputed domain name on the record of this proceeding is in connection with a public solicitation of offers to purchase, and an email specifically directed to Complainant from a third party using an email address associated with the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, requesting to initiate discussions regarding acquisition of the disputed domain name. Under the circumstances here, in which the disputed domain name identically incorporates Complainant's distinctive trademarks, an offer for sale of the disputed domain name seeks to take unfair advantage of Complainant's trademark rights and does not establish rights or legitimate interests.

Respondent has not responded to the Complaint and has not suggested any plausible legitimate grounds for registration and use of the disputed domain name. The Panel declines to speculate on what those might be.

The Panel finds that Complainant has demonstrated that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

¹ The Panel uses the term "trademark" in its inclusive sense to cover both goods and services marks.

² The disputed domain name adds the Top-Level Domain ("TLD") ".health" to Complainant's UCSF trademark.

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 Complainant's UCSF and UCSF HEALTH trademarks are well known in the field of public health in the United States and elsewhere based, inter alia, on a long history of significant research and development programs and corresponding publication.³ Complainant is a well-known provider of medical services in the San Francisco Bay Area. The acknowledged connection between Complainant's "brand" and the disputed domain name was expressly recognized in an unsolicited email directed specifically to Complainant from a third party using an email address associated with the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, requesting to initiate discussions regarding Complainant's acquisition of the disputed domain name. Respondent's public solicitation of offers to purchase the disputed domain name, together with the use of an email address associated with the website to which the disputed domain name resolves in connection with a targeted solicitation directed at Complainant, is further evidence that Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of Complainant's rights in its trademarks.

Respondent registered the disputed domain name in 2019, which postdates Complainant's registration of its UCSF trademark in 2012, but which predates Complainant's registration of its UCSF HEALTH trademark in 2023. In order to demonstrate abusive domain name registration and use, a complainant must demonstrate that it held rights in its trademark prior to a respondent's registration of a disputed domain name (with very limited exception). Since the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to each of Complainant's trademarks, Complainant's rights in its UCSF trademark are sufficient to establish a basis for finding abusive registration by Respondent. The Panel nonetheless recognizes that Complainant's rights in its UCSF HEALTH trademark substantially predate its 2023 registration of that trademark at the USPTO based on use in commerce as evidenced, inter alia, by registration of its <ucsfhealth.org> domain name in 2000.⁴

Respondent has offered the disputed domain name for sale on a publicly accessible website, suggesting value to its purchaser in the field of health. There is also evidence that a third party, using an email address associated with the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, solicited discussions with Complainant regarding the acquisition of the disputed domain name and expressly acknowledged the disputed domain name's obvious connection to Complainant and its brand. While the evidence does not establish the precise relationship between that third party and Respondent, these activities involving Complainant's distinctive trademarks support a finding by the Panel that Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the intention of selling it to Complainant or to a third party for valuable consideration in excess of Respondent's out-of-pocket expenses directly related to the disputed domain name (absent any evidence to the contrary from Respondent).

Respondent has not replied to the Complaint and has not suggested any alternative plausible grounds for registering and using the disputed domain name.

The Panel determines that Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Panel finds that Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

³ The Panel has considerable experience in the field of public health-related research and publication and attests to the well-known character of Complainant's trademarks as a matter of Administrative Notice.

⁴ Complainant's trademark registration application for UCSF HEALTH asserts a date of first use in commerce as early as 2015. Dates of first use must be supported by evidence, such as provided by Complainant here.

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 <ucsf.health> be transferred to Complainant.

/Frederick M. Abbott/

Frederick M. Abbott

Sole Panelist

Date: June 4, 2026