

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Novozymes A/S, Chr. Hansen A/S v. Idah Idah  
Case No. D2025-4774

### 1. The Parties

The Complainants are Novozymes A/S, Denmark and Chr. Hansen A/S, Denmark, represented by Abion AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Idah Idah, Indonesia.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <mynovonesis.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 18, 2025. On November 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 19, 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 (Redacted for Privacy (DT), Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on November 21, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint on November 25, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with 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 November 27, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 17, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 18, 2025.

The Center appointed Emre Kerim Yardimci as the sole panelist in this matter on December 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 Complainants, Novozymes A/S (“Novozymes”) and Chr. Hansen A/S (“Chr.Hansen”), two leading Danish biotechnology companies, merged to form a new entity named Novonesis.

Novonesis supplies a wide range of industry groups: household care, food and beverages, bioenergy, agriculture and feed, technical and pharmaceuticals. Novonesis employs around 10,000 people and works across more than 30 research and development and application centers and 23 manufacturing sites.

The second Complainant, Chr. Hansen, holds numerous trademark registrations for the mark NOVONESIS:

- United States of America trademark registration for NOVONESIS (word) registered under No. 79393904 on July 22, 2025.
- European Union trademark registration for NOVONESIS (word) registered under No. 018934974 on January 20, 2024;
- International trademark registration for NOVONESIS (word) registered under No. 1785790 on February 16, 2024.

The first Complainant, Novozymes, is the owner of the domain name <novonesis.com> which was registered on September 27, 2023. The first Complainant also operates an authorized subdomain under its domain name <novonesis.com>, namely <my.novonesis.com>.

The Respondent has registered the disputed domain name on September 28, 2025, and at the time of the Decision it resolves to an inactive error page. According to the Complainant, previously the disputed domain name redirected users to an unrelated third-party website, where the website offered a download to users.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainants**

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainants contend that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the second Complainant's trademark registration for NOVONESIS, as it incorporates the trademark in its entirety, and that the addition of the generic word “my” reinforces the association between the disputed domain name and the Complainants' trademark.

The Complainants consider that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, mainly because the Complainants have neither licensed nor otherwise authorized the Respondent to use its marks or to apply for or use any domain name incorporating the trademark NOVONESIS and the Respondent does not appear to be known by the disputed domain name.

In this respect, the Complainants state that the disputed domain name redirects users to unrelated third-party website where it is offered a download to users and that such activity is incompatible with any bona fide offering of goods or services or with any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name.

The Complainants contend that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainants claim that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name with the aim to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainants' trademark and for the purpose of disrupting the Complainants' business and targeting the Complainants' trademark. According to the Complainants,

- there is high risk that fraudulent emails are being distributed from the disputed domain name as the Mail Exchange ("MX") records are set up,
- it is likely that the Respondent is trying to conceal their name and contact details as the details are covered by a privacy shield in the corresponding Whois record which further suggests bad faith,
- the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to redirect users to what appears to be a fraudulent website,
- the first Complainant owns the subdomain name format <my.novonesis.com> and the addition of the term "my" in the second level portion of the disputed domain name reinforces the false impression that the disputed domain name is connected to the Complainants.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainants' contentions.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Pursuant to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainants are required to prove the presence of each of the following three elements to obtain the remedy it has requested:

- (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**

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.

A registered trademark provides a clear indication that the rights in the mark shown on the trademark certificate belong to its respective owner. The term "novonesis" is the distinctive part of the Complainants' trade name since 2024, and the Complainants hold several trademark registrations for NOVONESIS.

The disputed domain name <mynovonesis.com> integrates the Complainant's NOVONESIS trademark and the addition of the word "my" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

As regards the generic Top-Level Domain ".com", it is typically disregarded under the confusing similarity test.

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Complainant has shown that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights and satisfied the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

## **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

The onus is upon the Complainant to make out a *prima facie* case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and it is then for the Respondent to rebut this case.

The Panel accepts the Complainants' submissions that the Respondent does not appear to have been commonly known by the disputed domain name, has not made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name, and the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial use of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has not filed a Response.

In the Panel's view, the use of the disputed domain name by redirecting the users to unrelated third-party website where users are invited to download a file, does not amount to demonstrable preparation to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services nor can it be considered as a legitimate noncommercial use of the disputed domain name in the circumstances of the case.

Consequently, the Complainants have made out their *prima facie* case under this element of the Policy and the Respondent, has failed to rebut this case. In the circumstances of this case, and in view of the Panel's discussion below, the Panel finds that the second element of the Policy has been established.

## **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

Finally, the Complainant must show that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

The Complainants provided evidence proving that the start of their mergers business in January 2024. Moreover, the trademark registrations submitted by the Complainants show that the application for the mark NOVONESIS was made in 2024. The Panel thus accepts the Complainants' contention that the trademark NOVONESIS was registered and was in use at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name on September 28, 2025.

In the Panel's view, considering that "novonesis" is a coined term, it is inconceivable that the Respondent would not have known of the Complainants' trademark.

The Respondent has registered the disputed domain name but has not put it to any material use. In this respect, as discussed on second element in section B., redirecting the users to unrelated third-party website inviting users to download a file does not amount to demonstrable preparation to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering nor can it be considered as a legitimate noncommercial use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainants contend that the MX records for the disputed domain name has been set up and that there is high risk that fraudulent emails can be sent through the disputed domain name.

Moreover, revealed information given to the Registrar (name of the registrant, address, emails etc.) does not seem genuine and from the public records it appears that the Respondent has been involved in a pattern of conduct of registering typosquatted domain names.

In the view of the all above and considering the Panel's finding under the second element, the Panel finds that the registration and use of the disputed domain name falls under the circumstances described under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, namely, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for

commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by seeking to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. The current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not change Panel's finding of bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy have been met by the Complainant.

## **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 <mynovonesis.com> be transferred to the Complainants.

*/Emre Kerim Yardimci/*

**Emre Kerim Yardimci**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 12, 2026