

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lonza Ltd v. Pialsos Yumsilas

Case No. D2025-4126

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Pialsos Yumsilas, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lonzaaffiliationlab.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 9, 2025. On October 9, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same day, 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 (Privacy User #3b55956/ PrivacyGuardian.org llc) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 10, 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 October 20, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for the Response was November 9, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on November 10, 2025.

The Center appointed Zeynep Yasaman as the sole panelist in this matter on November 18, 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, by Procedural Order No.1 dated November 28, 2025, requested the Complainant to clarify its choice of Mutual Jurisdiction in compliance with paragraph 3(b)(xii) of the Rules by December 3, 2025. On December 2, 2025, the Complainant confirmed that it has chosen the jurisdiction at the location of the principal office of the Registrar as its Mutual Jurisdiction selection pursuant to paragraph 3(b)(xii) of the Rules.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant, Lonza Ltd, part of the Lonza Group Ltd., is one of the leading companies providing manufacturing services to the pharmaceutical, biotech, and nutrition markets.

The Complainant is the owner of several registered trademarks in different jurisdictions, including:

- The United States LONZA trademark, no. 956 300, registered on April 3, 1973, in class 5.
- The United States LONZA trademark, no. 4 639 815, registered on November 18, 2014, in classes 1 and 5.
- The United States LONZA trademark, no. 4 483 125, registered on February 18, 2014, in classes 9, 35, and 42.
- The United States LONZA trademark, no. 5 222 498, registered on June 13, 2017, in classes 40 and 42.
- The United States LONZA trademark, no. 4 922 144, registered on March 22, 2016, in classes 40, 41, and 42.

The Complainant operates a website at “www.lonza.com”, which was registered in 1997.

The disputed domain name <lonzaaffiliationlab.com> was registered on September 15, 2025. The Panel was unable to access the disputed domain name at the time of its Decision. However, based on the screenshots submitted by the Complainant, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name previously resolved to a parking page. The associated webpage displayed the disputed domain name at the top and, under the heading “Relevant searches”, featured automatically generated advertising links. These included terms such as “Healthcare for Companies”, “Lonza Nucleofector Kit”, “Fisher Chemical Products”, and “Compound Tirzepatide”. The page further contained a notice from the Registrar NameSilo stating that the domain name is registered with the registrar and inviting the domain holder to administer the domain via the registrar’s platform. At the bottom of the page, it was indicated that the website had been dynamically generated using the Sedo Domain Parking Program, and that the advertising links displayed were provided automatically by third parties without any relationship to either the domain name holder or Sedo.

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 it owns both common law rights and registered trademark rights in the LONZA trademarks in connection with a range of goods and services, and that the disputed domain name comprises the Complainant’s trademarks in the entirety with the addition of the term “affiliationlab” and the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com”. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name is identical and confusingly similar to the Complainant’s LONZA trademarks.

The Complainant argues that the term “lonza” is neither applied for nor registered as a trademark by the Respondent, and that the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent, by license or otherwise, to use the LONZA trademarks or to apply for any domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to those marks. According to the Complainant, the Respondent’s actions in connection with the disputed domain name are not a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor does the Respondent conduct a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under the Policy. The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent is wholly

appropriating the Complainant's trademark and is using the disputed domain name in connection with an active website consisting of a single page with pay-per-click links pertaining to chemical products, pharmaceuticals, and healthcare, which are the fields that the Complainant operates in. Furthermore, the Complainant argues that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor does the Respondent have any right to use the LONZA trademark. As such, the Complainant claims that it has established a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent engaged in bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name as the Respondent registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. According to the Complainant, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its rights in the LONZA trademarks, and that UDRP panels have consistently held that when an unaffiliated entity registers a domain name, which is confusingly similar or identical to a famous or widely known trademark, a presumption of bad faith is inferred. In this regard, the Complainant argues that the totality of the circumstances establishes that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith pursuant to the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy requires the complainant to show that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights.

Where the complainant holds a nationally or regionally registered trademark or service mark, this prima facie satisfies the threshold requirement of having trademark rights for purposes of standing to file a UDRP case (WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.2.1). In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant owns registered LONZA trademarks. Accordingly, the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy.

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 3.0](#), section 1.7).

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name reproduces entirely the Complainant's LONZA trademark with the addition of the term "affiliationlab", and the gTLD ".com". It is well established by panels applying the Policy that 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. Similarly, the applicable gTLD in a domain name (e.g., ".com") is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such, is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test (*H & M Hennes & Mauritz AB v. Donnie Lewis*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-0580](#)). In that regard, the Panel considers that while the addition of the term "affiliationlab" may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the addition of such a term 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). Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy.

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. These are as follows:

- (i) before any notice of the dispute, the respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) the respondent (as an individual, business, or other organization) has been commonly known by the domain name, even if the respondent has acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) the respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.

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 that 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 Panel notes that there is no evidence indicating that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the Complainant has also established that the Respondent is neither affiliated with the Complainant nor authorized or licensed to use the LONZA trademark or register the disputed domain name. Where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term (at the Second- or Top-Level), UDRP panels have largely held that such a composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. The Panel notes that the composition of the disputed domain name, which entirely incorporates the Complainant's trademark LONZA with the addition of the term "affiliationlab", creates the impression of an affiliation with the Complainant (e.g., an official LONZA affiliate laboratory, research unit, or corporate partnership platform). Such a composition cannot constitute fair use as it suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1).

Applying UDRP paragraph 4(c), panels have found that the use of a domain name to host a parked page comprising PPC links does not represent a bona fide offering where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant's mark or otherwise mislead Internet users ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9). In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name consisting of the Complainant's LONZA trademark along with terms such as "affiliation" and "lab" which gives the impression of the Complainant's affiliated laboratory and reflects the Respondent's intent to capitalize on the Complainant and its trademark. The Panel further observes that the links displayed on the parked page include terms related to the Complainant's field of activity. The Panel considers that such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, as the Respondent is taking unfair advantage of the goodwill associated with the Complainant's trademark and is misleadingly diverting consumers for commercial gain.

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:

- (i) circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered or has acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of its documented out of pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) that the respondent has registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) that the respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) that by using the domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the respondent's website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the respondent's website or location or of a product or service on the respondent's website or location.

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 that the Complainant's trademarks predate the registration of the disputed domain name, and that the Complainant's LONZA trademark is distinctive and well-established internationally in the pharmaceutical and biotechnology sectors. It is therefore inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its trademark when registering the disputed domain name, which incorporates the LONZA mark in its entirety. The Panel observes that the addition of the term "affiliationlab" further suggests an intention to create an impression of association with the Complainant, such as an official LONZA affiliate laboratory, research unit, or corporate partnership platform. Moreover, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name resolves to a parked page that displays links such as "Lonza Nucleofector Kit", "Fisher Chemical Products", and "Healthcare for Companies", which relate to the Complainant's field of activity. This further demonstrates that the disputed domain name targets Internet users seeking information about the Complainant and its products, thereby exploiting its reputation for commercial gain. In this regard, the Panel considers that the Respondent, by using the disputed domain name, has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website.

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 <lonzaaffiliationlab.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Zeynep Yasaman/

Zeynep Yasaman

Sole Panelist

Date: December 5, 2025