ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Lonza Ltd v. Ja sook Yang
Case No. D2026-3836

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Lonza Ltd, Switzerland, represented by Greer, Burns & Crain, Ltd., United States of America ("United States").

The Respondent is Ja sook Yang, United States.

2. The domain name and registrar

The disputed domain name <lonza-us.com> is registered with eNom, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural history

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 27, 2026. On August 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 27, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 28, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint.

The Center verified that the 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 September 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 27, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Haig Oghigian as the sole panelist in this matter on October 1, 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, Lonza Ltd, is a developer and manufacturer providing services in the pharmaceutical, biotech and nutrition industries. Founded in Gampel, Switzerland in 1897, the Complainant is now based in Basel, Switzerland and operates in over 30 locations in more than 12 countries. The Complainant employs approximately 20,000 individuals and had an annual revenue exceeding USD 6 billion in 2025.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for “LONZA” , such as but not limited to:

Trademark	Country	Registration Number	Registration Date
LONZA	Switzerland	364350	28-09-1988
LONZA	United States	956300	03-04-1973
LONZA	European Union	001101898	03-07-2000

The Complainant operates its website at <lonza.com> and others.

The disputed domain name <lonza-us.com>, was registered by the Respondent on July 26, 2026.

The Respondent is Ja sook Yang, located in the United States.

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 or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant demonstrated ownership of numerous trademark registrations for LONZA in numerous jurisdictions. The Complainant states that the disputed domain name is identical to the LONZA mark in which the Complainant has rights, except with the addition of “-US”, which as a suffix is a geographically descriptive term for the United States. The Complainant adds that the distinctiveness of the LONZA mark, as well as the Complainant’s industry recognition should be taken into account when assessing the first element.

-The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant argues that they have demonstrated rights to the LONZA mark, and that there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or owns any registered trademarks including the term “LONZA”. The Complainant further asserts that at no point has the Respondent been licensed to use its marks, nor are they affiliated with the Complainant. The Complainant adds that there is no evidence of any actual or contemplated good faith use of the disputed domain name for any bona fide offering; nor is there any evidence of legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Complainant’s mark.

-The disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith.

The Complainant states that the registration of the Complainant's trademarks predates the registration of the disputed domain name. Nonetheless, the Respondent has chosen to use the distinctive term "LONZA" in the disputed domain name. The Complainant alleges that is very likely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name using the LONZA mark intentionally in order to take advantage of the reputation of the trademark and the Complainant's goodwill, taking advantage of the Complainant's reputation as the disputed domain name is identical with the addition of a geographically descriptive term, and one for an area where the Complainant operates. The Complainant states that the disputed domain name was used in bad faith as it reproduces the Complainant's mark LONZA, which, if used to resolve to an active web page, may mislead the potential consumers by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark, and creating a false sense of connection or approval between the Complainant and the Respondent.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and findings

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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "us", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

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 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 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 Respondent registered the disputed domain name which contained the Complainant's distinct mark, with the addition of what appears to be a geographic indicator ("us"). The disputed domain name, given the distinctiveness of the Complainant's mark, therefore has a high degree of potential for misuse for illegitimate or illegal activities, particularly phishing.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of 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 <lonza-us.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Haig Oghigian/
Haig Oghigian
Sole Panelist
Date: October 14, 2026