

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Lonza Ltd v. Geral Gera, SEGLINK  
Case No. D2025-1342

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is Geral Gera, SEGLINK, Portugal.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <lonza.cam> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 2, 2025. On April 3, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 3, 2025, 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 Complainant on April 4, 2025, 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 April 14, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 4, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 6, 2025.

The Center appointed Eva Fiammenghi as the sole panelist in this matter on May 13, 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 a Swiss corporation headquartered in Basel, Switzerland. Founded in 1897, the Complainant is a leading global company in the fields of pharmaceuticals, biotechnology, and nutrition, providing contract development and manufacturing services to the pharmaceutical, biotech, and specialty ingredients markets. As of 2023, Lonza employed approximately 18,200 people across more than 35 countries, generating annual revenues exceeding CHF 6.7 billion.

The Complainant holds several trademark registrations for the trademark ZOOX in various jurisdictions, including the following:

- United States trademark LONZA, Reg. No. 956300, registered on April 3, 1973, in class 5.
- International trademark LONZA, Reg. No. 138182, registered on August 18, 1948, in classes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.
- European Union Trade Mark LONZA, No. 001101898, registered on July 3, 2000, in Classes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 16, 17, 19.

The Complainant also uses the domain name <lonza.com>, which is its official online presence and primary source of brand identity and communication.

The disputed domain name <lonza.cam> was registered on March 24, 2025, the disputed domain name was used to send fraudulent communications impersonating the Complainant.

#### **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 confusingly similar to its registered and well-known LONZA trademark. The disputed domain name incorporates the LONZA trademark in its entirety, which is sufficient to establish confusing similarity under the Policy.

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has never authorized the Respondent to use its trademark, nor is there any evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. Additionally, the Respondent has not demonstrated any bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial use of the disputed domain name.

Instead, the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant and engage in fraudulent activity, including sending phishing emails from an address linked to the disputed domain name "[...].@lonza.cam", which falsely instructed customers to redirect invoice payments to a fraudulent bank account.

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, as evidenced by the impersonation, use of the Complainant's name and logo, and phishing scheme. The Respondent's conduct demonstrates a deliberate attempt to mislead customers and divert funds by creating a false association with the Complainant.

Based on these facts and arguments, the Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed the Complainant must prove that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (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.

These elements are discussed in turn below. In considering these elements, paragraph 15(a) of the Rules provides that the Panel shall decide the Complaint on the basis of statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any other rules or principles of law that the Panel deems applicable.

Moreover, the Panel notes that the Registrar has confirmed the registrant of the disputed domain name as Geral Gera, SEGLINK of Portugal. Accordingly, the Panel finds Geral Gera, SEGLINK to be the Respondent for the purposes of this proceeding.

### **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 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 3.0](#), section 1.7).

Although the addition of the Top-Level Domain ("TLD") ".cam" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that it does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.).

The Panel finds that the LONZA trademark is clearly reproduced within the disputed domain name and that the disputed domain name seeks to capitalize on the distinctive character and reputation of the Complainant's trademark.

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 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 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 Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor is there evidence of any bona fide offering of goods or services, or legitimate noncommercial use.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity such as phishing, impersonation, and other types of fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. In this case, the Respondent used the disputed domain name to send fraudulent emails impersonating the Complainant, requesting that customers redirect payments to unauthorized bank accounts. This conduct clearly constitutes an illegal activity and a deceptive use of the disputed domain name ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1).

The Panel finds that 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 finds that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant’s well-known and distinctive trademark LONZA in its entirety and has been used to impersonate the Complainant by way of a fraudulent scheme. Specifically, the Respondent created and used an email address linked to the disputed domain name “[...]@lonza.cam” to contact customers of the Complainant, falsely claiming that Lonza had changed its bank account details and requesting redirection of payments. The Respondent’s conduct is evidenced by a phishing email submitted by the Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity such as phishing and impersonation constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. The registration and use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent appears to have been made precisely with the intent to deceive and mislead.

The fact that the Respondent did not respond to the Complaint further supports this finding of bad faith.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

## **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.cam> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Eva Fiammenghi/*

**Eva Fiammenghi**

Sole Panelist

Date: March 27, 2025