

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lonza Ltd v. Qbane Advert, qbaneadvertising
Case No. D2025-4127

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Qbane Advert, qbaneadvertising, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lonzastaff.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (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 (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 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.

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 <lonzastaff.com> was registered on September 24, 2025, and does not resolve to an active website. The associated website features only “Sorry! If you are the owner of this website, please contact your hosting provider: [...]@lonzastaff.com. It is possible you have reached this page because: the IP address has changed, there has been a server misconfiguration, the site may have moved to a different server.”

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 “staff” and the generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) “.com”. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name is therefore identical and confusingly similar to the Complainant's LONZA trademarks.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, that the term LONZA is neither applied for nor registered as a trademark by the Respondent, and that he 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 has wholly appropriated the Complainant's mark and is not using the disputed domain name in connection with an active website. As such, the Respondent's actions in connection with the disputed domain name cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services pursuant to the Policy, and the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect to the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent engaged in bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name by 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 "staff", 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 "staff" 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, given that the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website and the Respondent has not proven any use of the term corresponding to the disputed domain name, there is no use or demonstrable preparation to use the disputed domain name, or a name corresponding to it, in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Panel notes that there is no evidence indicating that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

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 “staff”, creates the impression of an affiliation with the Complainant (e.g., an internal recruitment site or employee portal). 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).

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. Moreover, the Panel observes that the addition of the descriptive term "staff" further suggests an intention to create an impression of association with the Complainant, such as an employment-related platform or internal corporate portal. This combination strongly supports the inference that the Respondent targeted the Complainant's mark at the time of registration.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. Factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, (iii) the respondent's concealing its identity or use of false contact details (noted to be in breach of its registration agreement), and (iv) the implausibility of any good faith use to which the domain name may be put ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3). In the present case, considering the distinctiveness and longstanding use of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, the Respondent's failure to submit any response to the Complainant's assertions, the concealment of its identity by a proxy service, the Panel finds the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

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

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 <lonzastaff.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Zeynep Yasaman/

Zeynep Yasaman

Sole Panelist

Date: November 26, 2025