

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lonza Ltd v. Allan KADDU

Case No. D2025-5448

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Allan KADDU, Uganda.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <headquarters-lonza.online> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 31, 2025. On January 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 3, 2026, 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 (UNAVAILABLE / REDACTED FOR PRIVACY / Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 6, 2026, 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 January 9, 2026.

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 January 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 29, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 1, 2026.

The Center appointed Alistair Payne as the sole panelist in this matter on February 6, 2026. 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 is part of the Lonza Group Ltd which provides manufacturing services to the pharmaceutical, biotech and nutrition markets with revenues of over USD 6.5 billion in 2024. The Complainant group has, since around 1913, used the LONZA trade mark in the pharmaceutical, biotechnology and nutrition space, in addition to other areas, such as custom manufacturing both in the United States and internationally. The Complainant owns numerous trade mark registrations worldwide for its LONZA mark, including United States trade mark registration number 956300 registered on April 3, 1973. The Complainant operates its main website at the domain name <lonza.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 28, 2025 and resolves to a website which features pay-per-click (“PPC”) links pertaining among others to pharmaceuticals and healthcare.

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 registered trade mark rights in the LONZA trade mark as set out above and that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant’s entire mark and differs only by the addition of a generic or descriptive term (in this case the term “headquarters- “), which is insufficient to prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant submits that it has not authorised the Respondent to use the LONZA trade mark or brand, or to apply for any domain name that is confusingly similar to its mark. It says that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name but is using the LONZA trade mark without authority to hold itself out falsely as being associated with the Complainant or the Complainant’s products thus causing confusion. It says that this use does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services under the Policy, nor is it a legitimate or noncommercial or fair use. It asserts that the Respondent is wholly appropriating the Complainant’s LONZA trade mark and is using the disputed domain name in connection with an active website consisting of a single page with PPC links pertaining to pharmaceuticals and healthcare, the same fields in which the Complainant operates. It says that such use of the disputed domain name to host a parked page comprising PPC links does not represent a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Noting that the disputed domain name was registered long after the date of registration of the Complainant’s trade mark it is highly implausible, according to the Complainant, that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant’s LONZA mark at the time that the disputed domain name was registered. According to the Complainant, the composition of the disputed domain name makes it more likely than not that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant’s LONZA trade mark in mind.

The Complainant submits that considering the fame and worldwide recognition of the Complainant's LONZA trade mark, the lack of evidence of any good faith use by the Respondent and that the Respondent has taken steps to conceal its identity, it is not possible to conceive of any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent that would not be illegitimate.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not 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 ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, the term "headquarters-" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such 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 3.1](#), 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 3.1](#), section 2.1.

The Complainant has submitted that it has not authorised the Respondent to use the LONZA trade mark, or to apply for any domain name that is confusingly similar to its mark. It has also submitted that the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name but is using the LONZA trade mark without authority to hold itself out falsely as being associated with the Complainant or the Complainant's products thus causing confusion. The Complainant has asserted that this use does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services under the Policy, nor is it a legitimate or noncommercial or fair use. It has

said that the Respondent is wholly appropriating the Complainant's LONZA trade mark and is using the disputed domain name in connection with an active website consisting of a single page with PPC links pertaining to pharmaceuticals and healthcare being the same fields in which the Complainant operates. It has submitted that such use of the disputed domain name to host a parked page comprising PPC links does not represent a bona fide offering of goods or services.

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.

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, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name was registered long after the date of registration of the Complainant's trade mark and as a result of very considerable use, in the context of a substantial business in the United States and internationally had developed a substantial reputation in connection with its LONZA mark by November 2025. Also, in circumstances that the Complainant's group operates an online presence at <lonza.com> and considering the degree of distinctiveness of the LONZA mark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, it is more likely than not that the Respondent, although ostensibly based in Uganda, was well aware of the Complainant's LONZA mark at the time that the disputed domain name was registered and registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant's LONZA trade mark in mind.

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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy there is evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith where a Respondent has used the disputed domain name to intentionally attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trade marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website.

In this case the Respondent has used the disputed domain name featuring the Complainant's very well reputed mark to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant, and to divert them to a Registrar's parking page which features PPC links among others to businesses in the pharmaceuticals and healthcare sectors, which links according to the Complainant, offer competing products. The Respondent has, in the Panel's view, intentionally registered and used the disputed domain name incorporating the Complainant's well-reputed mark in order to attract Internet users to this website likely for its own profit and has failed to submit any argument or evidence to contradict this conclusion. This amounts to conduct in terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy which is evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The fact that in all of these circumstances the Respondent used a privacy service to mask its identity only serves to reinforce the Panel's view of its bad faith. 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 <headquarters-lonza.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Alistair Payne/

Alistair Payne

Sole Panelist

Date: February 19, 2026