

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. Siyal Khan, Tamoor Siddique
Case No. D2025-3064

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Siyal Khan, Tamoor Siddique, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <gileadlifesciences.com> is registered with Cosmotown, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 1, 2025. On August 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 7, 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 (Private Whois) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 11, 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 August 11, 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 August 14, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 3, 2025. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on August 16, 2025, indicating its agreement to the transfer of the disputed domain name. The Complainant emailed back that it was not interested in settling the matter and did not agree to the suspension of the proceedings. Pursuant to paragraph 6 of the Rules, on September 4, 2025, the Center informed the Parties that it would proceed with the panel appointment process.

The Center appointed Adam Samuel as the sole panelist in this matter on October 1, 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.

The Panel has decided not to suspend or terminate the proceedings. The Complainant has indicated that it is not interested in settling the case and does not wish the proceedings to be suspended. Rule 17 requires both parties to request a suspension or agree on a settlement for the Panel to suspend or terminate the proceedings.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a US international biopharmaceutical company. It owns a number of trademarks for GILEAD, including US registration no. 3,251,595, registered on June 12, 2007, and GILEAD SCIENCES, including US registration no. 1,611,838, registered on September 4, 1990. The disputed domain name was registered on October 31, 2024. The Complainant uses the domain name <gilead.com> registered on May 27, 1995, to market its products.

Currently, the disputed domain name resolves to a page that reads: "Account suspended. This Account has been suspended. Contact your hosting provider for more information." The Complainant has provided evidence that the disputed domain name has been used to send email communications purporting to come from 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 dispute domain name contains the Complainant's well-known GILEAD and GILEAD SCIENCES trademarks. The Respondent willfully adopted the GILEAD and GILEAD SCIENCES marks within the disputed domain name in an attempt to unfairly capitalize on the valuable goodwill the Complainant has built in its marks and with the intention of using the disputed domain name in a potential visa fraud scam.

The Respondent is not associated or affiliated with the Complainant. The Complainant has not granted any rights to the Respondent to use the GILEAD or GILEAD SCIENCES marks, whether a license to sell any products or offer any services, or any rights to register the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has sent emails from the disputed domain name using a signature block containing the GILEAD logo. The following acts by the Respondent demonstrate bad faith use and registration: 1) the intentional registration of a domain name containing the GILEAD trademark with knowledge of the Complainant's business and longstanding use of the marks; 2) using the Complainant's trademarks alongside the term "life sciences" to purposely create the perception that the Respondent is affiliated with the Complainant; 3) using an email signature block with the GILEAD logo to falsely imply that the Respondent is a representative of the Complainant; and 4) using the disputed domain name in an apparent scam to obtain documentation in support of fraudulent visas.

The Respondent held itself out as a representative of "Gilead Life Sciences Pakistan" – an entity which does not exist – in email correspondence with a third party in Dublin, Ireland requesting a customized training program for "Gilead" in Dublin for alleged Gilead company employees located in Pakistan. After exchanging emails with the third party to coordinate the training, the Respondent obtained invitation letters for six trainees to support their travel visas to Ireland.

On May 9, 2025, the Complainant sent a demand letter to the address demanding that the entity cease use of the GILEAD mark and transfer the dispute domain name. The Complainant has never received a reply to this communication. This is even further evidence of bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent has consented to the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant but has not otherwise responded to the Complaint.

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied:

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

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's trademark GILEAD SCIENCES with the word "life" separating those two words and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com". The gTLD is irrelevant here as it is a standard registration requirement. See section 1.11.1 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)").

Section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#) says:

"Where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive [...] or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element."

Here, the insertion of the word "life" between the two words of the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Respondent is not called "gilead sciences" or anything similar. There is no evidence that the Complainant has ever authorised the Respondent to use its trademarks. The Respondent appears to have used the disputed domain name to email an Irish training business in order to make a booking for a training event, using the Complainant's trademark GILEAD and logo for this purpose.

For these reasons, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has met this element. See section 2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Respondent has been using the Complainant's trademark and logo on its emails to an Irish company in order to impersonate the Complainant. That is evidence of bad faith for the purposes of the Policy. When it

did this, it knew who the Complainant was and presumably did so when it registered the disputed domain name. In the circumstances, it is unnecessary to decide exactly what the Respondent was seeking to achieve through its correspondence with the Irish training business. .

For all these reasons, 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 <gileadlifesciences.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Adam Samuel/

Adam Samuel

Sole Panelist

Date: October 15, 2025