

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. Odion Igbedion, Dc
Case No. D2025-2407

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Odion Igbedion, Dc, Nigeria.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <gilead-sciencesinc.com> is registered with Global Domain Group, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 18, 2025. On June 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 20, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 20, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar. The Complainant filed a request for amendment of the Complaint on June 20, 2025, and an amended Complaint on June 24, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the request for amendment of the Complaint and 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 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 20, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 21, 2025.

The Center appointed Monica Novac as the sole panelist in this matter on July 24, 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 Gilead Sciences, Inc., founded in 1987 in the United States, which is one of the largest biopharmaceutical companies in the world. The Complainant discovers, develops and commercializes innovative medicines in the areas of unmet medical need. In 2024, the Complainant's total worldwide revenue was approximately USD 28.8 billion. Moreover, in 2024, the Complainant was listed as #154 in the Fortune 500 Companies rankings. The Complainant employs approximately 18,000 individuals worldwide.

The Complainant holds exclusive rights over the GILEAD and GILEAD SCIENCES trademarks (hereinafter referred to as the "Trademarks") worldwide, secured by over 230 trademark registrations around the world and through ongoing use, including, but not limited to, the following:

- (i) United States Registration no. 1611838 GILEAD SCIENCES, registered on September 4, 1990 for goods in Class 5;
- (ii) Mexico Registration no. 462911 GILEAD SCIENCES, registered on June 9, 1994 for goods in Class 5; and
- (iii) Japan Registration no. 2352515 GILEAD SCIENCES, registered on November 29, 1991 for goods in Class 10.

The Complainant owns more than 350 domain names that incorporate its Trademarks, including <gilead.com> (registered on May 27, 1995 and used by the Complainant since 1997 in connection with its pharmaceutical products and related medical devices).

The disputed domain name was registered on April 4, 2025. According to the evidence filed by the Complainant (Exhibits D and E to the Complaint), the disputed domain name seems to be a parked page. As of the date of this Decision, when accessed by the Panel, the disputed domain name shows an inactive website.

The Respondent is apparently located in Nigeria. The Respondent has no connection to the Complainant. As stated by the Complainant (also see Exhibit D to the Complaint), the Respondent has impersonated one of the Complainant's employees in a scam in which the Respondent contacted third party companies by filling out online contact forms or sending emails directly to request quotes for goods or services, likely in an attempt to collect sensitive financial information or otherwise defraud the third party companies.

The Respondent did not file a reply; thus, little information is known on the Respondent.

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 Complainant's Trademarks since it contains the Complainant's well-known and famous GILEAD and GILEAD SCIENCES trademarks. The fact that the disputed domain name includes the additional element "inc" does not eliminate the confusion with the

Complainant's Trademarks; on the contrary, it increases the likelihood of perceived affiliation with the Complainant as "inc" is a corporate identifier referring to the Complainant's corporate name Gilead Sciences, Inc.

- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, the Respondent is not associated or affiliated with the Complainant. The Complainant has not granted any rights to the Respondent to use the Trademarks, whether a license to sell any products or offer any services, or any rights to register the disputed domain name. The Respondent's strategy for registering the disputed domain name to capture and divert Internet search engine queries made by individuals seeking the Complainant's genuine pharmaceutical products is clear on its face based on the registration of the disputed domain name containing the entirety of the Trademarks. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name in a phishing attack or other fraudulent scheme impersonating a Complainant's employee to scam third parties does not constitute a legitimate interest. The Complainant's GILEAD trademarks are so well-known and recognized that there can be no legitimate use by the Respondent. The Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name can be seen for no other purpose than to wrongfully divert traffic from the Complainant's legitimate website and perpetuate a phishing scam or other fraudulent scheme for its own commercial gain, which on its face shows a lack of any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

- the disputed domain name has been registered and it is being used in bad faith. According to the Complainant, when viewing the totality of the circumstances, the following acts by the Respondent demonstrate bad faith use and registration: 1) the intentional registration of a domain name consisting of the GILEAD and GILEAD SCIENCES trademarks followed by the Complainant's corporate identifier "inc", this creating an association with the Complainant; 2) purposefully registering a domain with search terms to divert Internet users; and 3) using the disputed domain name in a phishing scam by sending deceptive communications where the Respondent requested quotes for goods and services, likely in an attempt to induce the disclosure of sensitive financial information or for some other fraudulent purpose. At the very least, the Respondent had constructive knowledge of the Complainant's Trademarks and its rights due to Complainant's longstanding worldwide trademark registrations covering the GILEAD and GILEAD SCIENCES marks. The Respondent is fully aware of the Complainant's business, as well as its goodwill in the Trademarks in the healthcare industry and registered the disputed domain name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, a complainant to succeed must satisfy the panel that:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which 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.

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 GILEAD and GILEAD SCIENCES trademarks is reproduced within the disputed domain name. The Panel finds that the GILEAD and GILEAD SCIENCES trademarks are recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's Trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The disputed domain name also contains the term "inc", however the Panel finds that the addition of this element does not prevent finding a confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's Trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. According to the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8, where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element.

According to the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1, the gTLD ".com" in the disputed domain name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

Further to all the above, 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 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.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent is not associated or affiliated with the Complainant. The Complainant has not granted any rights to the Respondent to use the Trademarks, whether a license to sell any products or offer any services, or any rights to register the disputed domain name. There is also no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's GILEAD and GILEAD SCIENCES trademarks, plus the additional element "inc" which is the Complainant's corporate identifier; this is a further evidence that at the time of registering the disputed domain name, the Respondent was aware of (i) the Complainant's Trademarks, (ii) the Complainant's business and (iii) the Complainant's legal form of incorporation. In view of the above, the Panel is of the opinion that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name only for the purpose of misleading or causing confusion with the Complainant, its business and the goods/services offered by the Complainant.

The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name in a phishing attack or other fraudulent scheme impersonating a Complainant's employee to scam third parties does not confer rights or legitimate interests to the Respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Respondent did not respond to the Complainant's contentions; thus, the Respondent did not present any evidence for supporting any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Further to all the above, 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 Complainant registered the GILEAD SCIENCES trademarks approximately 35 years before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. In view of the worldwide reputation of the Complainant, the recognition of its Trademarks and the composition of the disputed domain name which totally incorporates the GILEAD and GILEAD SCIENCES trademarks plus the Complainant's corporate identifier "inc", it is unlikely that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant's Trademarks and business when registering the disputed domain name. The Panel considers that the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's Trademarks creates a false association or affiliation with the Complainant and it is a clear proof of the Respondent's 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.

The evidence presented in this case shows that Respondent, impersonating one of Complainant's employees, used the disputed domain name to send deceptive communications requesting quotes for goods and services, likely in an attempt to induce the disclosure of sensitive financial information or for some other fraudulent purpose. The Panel considers that Respondent's acts mislead and damage the third parties who erroneously believe that the communications originate from the Complainant or are endorsed by the Complainant and also harm the Complainant itself. The Panel is of the opinion that Respondent's use of the disputed domain name in connection to the above illegitimate activities (e.g., sending deceptive emails, phishing, impersonation) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

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

Further to all the above, 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 <gilead-sciencesinc.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Monica Novac/

Monica Novac

Sole Panelist

Date: August 5, 2025