

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Novozymes A/S and Chr. Hansen A/S v. ajantha Hgagas
Case No. D2026-2520

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Novozymes A/S, Denmark, and Chr. Hansen A/S, Denmark, represented by Abion AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is ajantha Hgagas, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <novonesls.com> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 10, 2026. On June 11, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 12, 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 (Redacted for Privacy, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on June 12, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint on June 16, 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 June 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 13, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 14, 2026.

The Center appointed Mireille Buydens as the sole panelist in this matter on July 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

The Complainants are two Danish biotechnology companies, which merged in January 2024 to form the group Novonesis, establishing one of the global leaders in industrial enzymes and microbial solutions, with nearly 50% market share in both and 3,9 billion dollars turnover in 2024. Novonesis employs around 10,000 people and works across more than 30 research and development centers and 23 manufacturing sites. The Complainants, active under the NOVONESIS brand, are notably active in the United States, where they have several subsidiaries and production facilities.

The Complainants hold numerous trademark registrations for the sign NOVONESIS (hereafter “the NOVONESIS Trademark” or “the Trademark”), including the following:

- United States trademark registration No. 7870271 for NOVONESIS (word mark) registered on July 22, 2025;
- European Union trademark registration No. 018934974 for NOVONESIS (word mark) registered on January 20, 2024; and
- International trademark registration No. 1785790 for NOVONESIS (word mark) registered on February 16, 2024.

The Complainants further own and operate several domain names including the NOVONESIS Trademark, including <novonesis.com> (created on September 27, 2023 and used for their official website), <novonesis.ai> (created on October 8, 2025) and <novonesis.cloud> (created on December 13, 2023).

The disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent on March 10, 2026. The disputed domain name redirects Internet users to a third-party website displaying a human verification page.

The Complainants sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent via the Registrar on April 16, 2026, and requested that the Registrar forward it to the Respondent. The Complainants also contacted the Respondent via the Registrar’s online contact form. The Complainants sent further reminders on April 28, 2026, and May 5, 2026. According to the Complaint, no response was received by the Complainants.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainants

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

First, the Complainants contend that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the NOVONESIS Trademark as it contains a misspelled version of the Trademark, namely the NOVONESIS Trademark with the replacement of the letter “i” with the visually similar letter “l”. This slight alteration does not prevent the finding of confusing similarity, as the disputed domain name clearly reproduces the overall impression of the NOVONESIS Trademark. The generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com” can be disregarded when assessing the confusing similarity test due to it being a mere technical requirement.

Second, the Complainants contend that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name has been registered after the NOVONESIS Trademark. The Complainants never granted the Respondent any rights to use the NOVONESIS Trademark in any form, including in the disputed domain name. The Respondent’s name does not correspond to the term

“novonesls” and the Complainants have not found that the Respondent is known by the disputed domain name, nor does the Respondent own any trademark registration corresponding to the disputed domain name. The Respondent could have performed a trademark or online search before registering the disputed domain name and would have learnt that the NOVONESIS Trademark is owned and used by the Complainants. However, the Respondent chose to register a misspelled version of the NOVONESIS Trademark as a domain name. This cannot amount to fair use, nor can it confer rights or legitimate interests. The Complainants finally assert that the Respondent never responded to their cease-and-desist letter.

The Complainants contend that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith. Concerning the registration in bad faith, the Complainants contend that the registration of the NOVONESIS Trademark pre-dates the registration of the disputed domain name. By conducting a simple online search, the Respondent would have inevitably learnt about the Complainants and the NOVONESIS Trademark. It is therefore inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the existence of the Complainants and their Trademark when it registered the disputed domain name. Besides, the disputed domain name is an obvious misspelling of the distinctive and coined NOVONESIS Trademark, as the only difference between the Trademark and the disputed domain name is the replacement of the letter “i” with the visually similar letter “l”.

Concerning the use in bad faith, the disputed domain name redirects Internet users to a third-party website displaying a human verification page. By using the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to third-party content, the Respondent is intentionally attempting to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainants’ NOVONESIS Trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website. Furthermore, the Complainants assert that the disputed domain name has active Mail Exchange (“MX”) records. This entails that the Respondent could send emails through the email addresses “[...]@novonesls.com” and thereby use the disputed domain names to send fraudulent emails. The Complainants further assert that the Respondent’s use of a privacy service to conceal its identity, as reflected in the publicly available Whois records, further supports a finding of bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Dealing with the Respondent’s failure to file a response to the Complaint, paragraph 14(b) of the Rules provides that if a party, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, does not comply with a provision of, or requirement under these Rules, the panel shall be entitled to draw such inferences from this omission, as it considers appropriate.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that the Complainants prove each of the following three elements in order to succeed in their Complaint:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainants have 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 Complainants’ trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 1.7.

The Complainants have 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 Panel finds the NOVONESIS Trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The NOVONESIS Trademark is reproduced in the disputed domain name with the mere replacement of the letter “i” by the visually similar letter “l”, which is an obvious misspelling. A domain name which consists of a variation of a trademark (typically a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling, referred to as typosquatting) is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the NOVONESIS Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The gTLD (here “.com”), as a standard requirement of domain name registration, may be disregarded in the assessment of identity or confusing similarity.

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 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 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 Policy or otherwise.

According to the Complaint, which has not been rebutted by the Respondent, the Respondent is not licensed by or affiliated with the Complainants in any way. There is no evidence that the Respondent would be commonly known under the disputed domain name, nor is there any evidence of use or demonstrable plans to use the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services. There is no evidence of legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, either.

On the contrary, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name reproduces the NOVONESIS Trademark in its entirety with an obvious and most likely intentional misspelling (the letter “i” in “novonesis” is replaced by the visually similar letter “l”). Such misspelling will go unnoticed by most Internet users. As a result, the Panel finds, on balance, that such composition reflects the Respondent’s ultimate intent to confuse unsuspecting Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name is operated by the Complainants.

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 disputed domain name consists of the Complainants' NOVONESIS Trademark with an obvious misspelling, namely the replacement of the letter "i" by the visually similar letter "l", which amounts to typosquatting. The NOVONESIS Trademark predates the registration of the disputed domain name. The NOVONESIS Trademark is inter alia registered in the United States, where the Respondent is purportedly located. A quick NOVONESIS trademark search, or even an online search, would have revealed to the Respondent the existence of the Complainants and their NOVONESIS Trademark. As a result, the Panel finds that the Respondent was more likely than not aware of the Complainants' Trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) section 3.2.2.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides that a domain name is used in bad faith when, by using the domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the respondent's website or location or of a product or service on the respondent's website or location. In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name reproduces the NOVONESIS Trademark with a misspelling (replacement of the letter "i" by the letter "l") and is used to redirect Internet users to a third-party site. This misspelling, combined with the gTLD ".com" which is also used by the Complainants for the official NOVONESIS website, reinforces the finding that the Respondent was aware of and intended to target the Complainants and their NOVONESIS Trademark.

The Panel concludes that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainants' NOVONESIS Trademark.

Furthermore, the failure of the Respondent to submit a response supports a finding of bad faith, given all the circumstances of the case. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <novonesls.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mireille Buydens/
Mireille Buydens
Sole Panelist
Date: August 3, 2026