

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. mesut erdogan
Case No. D2025-2291

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Gilead Sciences, Inc., United States of America (“United States” or “US”), represented internally.

The Respondent is mesut erdogan, Türkiye.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <gileadforgood.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 12, 2025. On June 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 13, 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 (Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 13, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on June 24, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 June 25, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 15, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 25, 2025.

The Center appointed Karen Fong as the sole panelist in this matter on July 29, 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, a biopharmaceutical company with its headquarters in the United States, was founded in 1987. It discovers, develops and commercialises innovative medicines in areas of unmet medical need. In 2024, the Complainant's total worldwide revenue was approximately USD 28.6 billion. The Complainant's pharmaceutical product VEKLURY was authorised for emergency use by the United States Food and Drug Administration during the Covid-19 pandemic.

The Complainant owns a large number of trade mark registrations around the world for GILEAD. This includes the following:

- US Trade Mark Registration No. 3251595 for GILEAD registered on June 12, 2007;
- United Kingdom Trade Mark Registration No. 00903913167 for GILEAD registered on November 7, 2005;
- China Trade Mark Registration No. 816124 for GILEAD registered on February 21, 1996;

(individually and collectively referred to as the "Trade Mark").

The Complainant's main website is at the domain name <gilead.com>. It also owns more than 350 domain names that incorporate the Trade Mark. On December 18, 2024, the Complainant filed two applications in the United States for the mark GILEAD FOR GOOD (US Trade Mark Application Nos. 98909338 and 98909343). This mark was filed in connection with promoting public awareness of environmental, social and governance (ESG) initiatives, business information services regarding ESG, charitable foundation services, namely providing financial assistance for programs and services of others and charitable services in the name of providing grants for under-represented communities.

The Respondent appears to be based in Türkiye. The disputed domain name was registered under privacy on December 18, 2024, the same day in which the GILEAD FOR GOOD trade mark applications were filed in the US. The disputed domain name redirects to Godaddy parking pages where it was listed for sale for a "Buy Now" price of USD 2,850. At the time of this decision the "Buy Now" price has increased to USD 2,988.

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 the Trade Mark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name, and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not file a response.

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 Trade Mark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the entirety of the Trade Mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of the other terms here, "for good" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Based on the available record, 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.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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 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.

Moreover, the nature of the disputed domain name is inherently misleading as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Based on the available record, 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 must have been aware of the Trade Mark when the Respondent registered the disputed domain name given that the disputed domain name was registered on the same day that Complainant applied to register the mark GILEAD FOR GOOD and the disputed domain name comprises these exact same terms in their entirety. The disputed domain name was clearly registered in bad faith.

The disputed domain name is also being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name is being offered for sale by the Respondent on a domain name marketplace for a sum which well exceeds the costs directly related to the registration of the disputed domain name. This is evidence that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling as set out in paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

In the circumstances, the Panel therefore concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 <gileadforgood.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Karen Fong/

Karen Fong

Sole Panelist

Date: August 16, 2025