

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lonza Ltd v. Domain Administrator
Case No. D2025-1051

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Domain Administrator, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <lonza-bioscience-155369736.click> and <lonza-bioscience-349254693.click> are registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 14, 2025. On March 14, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On March 16, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY / Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 17, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant elected not to amend the Complaint. The Panel finds for the purposes of this decision that the Respondent is "Domain Administrator" as disclosed by the Registrar.

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 March 28, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 17, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 22, 2025.

The Center appointed Gill Mansfield as the sole panelist in this matter on April 28, 2025. 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 is part of the Lonza Group Ltd., a company providing manufacturing services to the pharmaceutical, biotechnology, and nutrition markets. At least as early as 1955, it adopted and has used the LONZA trademark in the United States in the pharmaceutical, biotechnology, and nutrition space as well as other areas such as custom manufacturing. As of 2023 it had revenues of over USD 2.1 billion in the United States alone.

The Complainant has a portfolio of international registrations for the LONZA trademark, with trademark registrations in over 30 countries including (inter alia) the following:

- United States trademark registration number 956300 for LONZA (word mark) registered on April 3, 1973 in classes 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 11, and 31.
- United States trademark registration number 4483125 for LONZA (word mark) registered on February 18, 2014 in classes 9, 35, and 42.
- European Union trademark registration number 001101898 for LONZA (word mark) registered on July 3, 2000 in classes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 16, 17, and 19.

The Complainant uses the LONZA mark as part of its company name and it operates a website at "www.lonza.com".

The disputed domain names were both registered on February 10, 2025, and both resolve to inactive websites.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant points to its ownership of trademark registrations for the LONZA mark for a variety of goods and services in over 30 countries worldwide and contends that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's LONZA marks. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. It states that the Complainant has not authorised, by licence or otherwise, the Respondent to use the LONZA trademark or brand, or to apply for any domain name that is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, domain name or brand. It contends that the use of the disputed domain names is not in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services under section 4(c)(i) of the Policy or a legitimate noncommercial fair use under section 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. The Complainant notes that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain names in relation to active websites. The Complainant also contends that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names. Finally, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. It submits that the disputed domain names were registered for the purpose of creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement. It further submits that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant, and its rights in the LONZA mark as a result of which bad faith can be inferred. The Complainant submits that given the fame and worldwide recognition of the Complainant's LONZA mark, the

lack of any evidence of good faith use and steps to conceal the Respondent's identity, it is not possible to conceive of any plausible actual or contemplated good faith use of the disputed domain names.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy the Complainant carries the burden of proving:

- (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights, and
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and
- (iii) that 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 trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain names (and is clearly recognizable as the dominant element within the disputed domain names). Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, the addition of the term "-bioscience-" followed by a series of nine numbers, "155369736" in respect of one disputed domain name, and "349254693" in respect of the other disputed domain name) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The applicable Top-Level Domain ("TLD") in a domain name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1. As such, the ".click" generic TLD in the disputed domain names is disregarded for the purposes of the first element confusing similarity test.

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 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 3.0](#), 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel notes that the Respondent has not been authorised or licensed by the Complainant to use the LONZA trademark, or to apply for any domain name which uses the LONZA trademark or is confusingly similar to the LONZA trademark, domain name or brand.

There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by either of the disputed domain names, and given the composition of the disputed domain names, nor could there be any plausible argument that it is. There is also no evidence of use, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names for a bona fide offering of goods or services, or evidence of legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. On the contrary, the disputed domain names both resolve to inactive websites.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain names comprise the Complainant's distinctive LONZA trademark with the addition of the descriptive term "-bioscience-". The Panel also notes that the term "bioscience" directly corresponds to the Complainant's field of business activity which is pharmaceuticals and biotechnology. Each of the disputed domain names also contains a string of nine numbers following the LONZA trademark and the descriptive term "-bioscience-". These numbers in the disputed domain names have the effect of visually mimicking the Uniform Resource Locator ("URL") of a webpage. Collectively, this creates the impression that the disputed domain names are those of the Complainant, or related, linked to, or affiliated with the Complainant.

As such, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain names is such as to carry a risk of implied affiliation that cannot constitute fair use, as it effectively impersonates the Complainant, or suggests affiliation with, or sponsorship or endorsement by, the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Further, under paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw from the lack of response of the Respondent such inferences as it considers appropriate. The Panel is of the view that the lack of response from the Respondent corroborates the absence of any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain name.

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.

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 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel notes the long use of the distinctive LONZA trademark by the Complainant, that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names seventy years after the Complainant's earliest uses of the LONZA trademark, and the Complainant's portfolio of LONZA trademark registrations worldwide. In addition, the Panel notes the structure and composition of the disputed domain names, comprising the Complainant's registered LONZA trademark with the addition of the term "-bioscience-" (which, as noted

above, directly corresponds to the Complainant's field of business activity) and a string of nine numbers (which visually mimic the URL of a webpage).

Having regard to these factors, it is highly implausible that that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and the Complainant's LONZA mark at the time that the disputed domain names were registered, and the composition of the disputed domain names makes it more likely than not that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with the Complainant's LONZA trademark in mind.

The record shows that the disputed domain names do not resolve to active websites.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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 names, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names 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 names <lonza-bioscience-155369736.click> and <lonza-bioscience-349254693.click> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gill Mansfield/

Gill Mansfield

Sole Panelist

Date: May 12, 2025