

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. Thomas Wooldridge
Case No. D2025-4275

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Thomas Wooldridge, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <gilead-usa.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 17, 2025. On October 20, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 21, 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 (Registration Private / Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 22, 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 October 23, 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 October 27, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 16, 2025. The Respondent sent email communications to the Center on October 27, 2025, and October 28, 2025, stating that he did not contest the proceeding and consented to the transfer of the disputed domain name. The Complainant chose to continue with the proceeding.

The Center appointed Elizabeth Ann Morgan as the sole panelist in this matter on November 20, 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, founded in 1987 in Foster City, California, United States is one of the largest and most successful biopharmaceutical companies in the world. The Complainant discovers, develops, and commercializes innovative medicines in areas of unmet medical need. In 2024, the Complainant's total worldwide revenue was approximately USD 28.8 billion.

The GILEAD mark serves as a identifier of the Complainant, as well as its various goods and services such as its pharmaceutical medications, health information and education services, and its pharmaceutical research and charitable services. Through longstanding use and the tremendous success of its products, the GILEAD mark has gained significant recognition in the United States and throughout the world.

The Complainant owns exclusive rights to the GILEAD trademark worldwide secured by over 178 trademark registrations around the world and through ongoing use, including, but not limited to, the following registrations:

- GILEAD – U.S. Reg. No. 3,251,595, registered on June 12, 2007, covering “pharmaceutical preparations, namely, antivirals, antifungals and preparations for the treatment of infectious conditions” in Class 5;
- GILEAD – Singapore Reg. No. T0803446D, registered on July 24, 2008, covering “pharmaceuticals” in Class 5 and;
- GILEAD – India Reg. No. 2363685, registered on September 10, 2015, covering “pharmaceutical preparations” in Class 5.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <gilead.com>, which was registered on May 27, 1995, and has been used by the Complainant since as early as 1997 in connection with its pharmaceutical products and related medical services.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on September 30, 2025.

The disputed domain name resolves to a website with “GILEAD USA” prominently featured at the top of the page. The statement “Innovative Medicines for Serious Illnesses” is superimposed over photograph depicting a laboratory setting, where a person wearing personal protective equipment is handling a petri dish and pipette. The GILEAD USA banner uses a nearly identical font as that which is used for the text GILEAD in the Complainant's logo. Further, the webpage references innovation and medicine, which is directly relevant to Complainant's position as a leader in the biopharmaceutical industry. The webpage footer reads “Contact Us” with a pop-up chat box for direct messaging.

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 its registered trademarks, and was registered and is being used in bad faith to divert Internet traffic from Complainant's legitimate site to the Respondent's website. The Respondent has no connection to the Complainant, and there is no legitimate reason for the Respondent to have registered the disputed domain name containing the Complainant's trademark. The webpage contents were likely published by the Respondent to capture Internet traffic intended for the Complainant and collect personal information from users or for some other illegitimate purpose.

B. Respondent

Other than sending two emails to the Center consenting to the requested remedy, the Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions.

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 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 mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name with the addition of "-usa". However, while the use of additional term in the disputed domain name may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, it does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7 and section 1.8.

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.

In fact, the use of the geographic term "usa" in the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant, since the Complainant's corporate headquarters are located in the United States. Thus, the addition of "usa" to the Complainant's mark would mislead Internet users to believe the disputed domain name is associated with the Complainant. [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.

In the present case, considering the Complainant's reputation and the composition of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew or should have known of the Complainant's trademark, and registered the Complainant in bad faith. The Panel notes that the Respondent use of the disputed domain name for cybersquatting to intentionally attract for commercial gain Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 <gilead-usa.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Elizabeth Ann Morgan/

Elizabeth Ann Morgan

Sole Panelist

Date: December 3, 2025