

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lonza Ltd v. Mitsuru Wellington, Mita Limousine, Inc.
Case No. D2026-0717

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Mitsuru Wellington, Mita Limousine, Inc., United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lonzq.com> is registered with Network Solutions, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 18, 2026. On February 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 20, 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 (PERFECT PRIVACY, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 23, 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 March 2, 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 March 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 23, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Anna Carabelli as the sole panelist in this matter on March 31, 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 following facts are undisputed.

The Complainant is part of the Lonza Group Ltd., a global provider of manufacturing services to the pharmaceutical, biotech and nutrition markets with revenues of over USD 6.5 billion in 2024, including over USD 2 billion in the United States alone.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for LONZA in various jurisdictions including the United States where the Respondent is purportedly based. The Complainant's trademark portfolio includes (inter alia) the following:

- United States trademark registration No. 956300 for LONZA (word mark), filed on December 22, 1969, and registered on April 3, 1973, in International classes 1, 2, 4 and 5;
- United States trademark registration No. 4483125 for LONZA (word mark), filed on February 14, 2013, and registered on February 18, 2014, in International classes 9, 35 and 42;
- United States trademark registration No. 4922144 for LONZA (word mark), filed on June 16, 2015, and registered on March 22, 2016, in International classes 40, 41 and 42;
- United States trademark registration No. 5222498 for LONZA (figurative mark), filed on November 03, 2016, and registered on June 13, 2017, in International classes 40 and 42;
- United States trademark registration No. 4639815 for LONZA (figurative mark), filed on December 9, 2013, and registered on November 18, 2014, in International classes 1, 2 and 5.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <lonza.com> which resolves to its official website where the Complainant promotes its products and services under the trademark LONZA.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 14, 2026, and resolves to an inactive webpage stating that the page/site cannot be reached.

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 Complainant's LONZA trademark is distinctive and closely identified with the Complainant due to its extensive and longstanding use (dating back to 1913), and enjoys a high degree of renown as recognized in prior UDRP decisions (See, *Lonza Ltd. v. phillip decker*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4139](#); *Lonza Ltd v. Domain Administrator*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1051](#); *Lonza Ltd v. John Smit, owner*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1211](#)).
- The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant trademark LONZA, since it reproduces the Complainant's trademark with a typo consisting of the substitution of the final letter "a" for "q".
- The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name since: (i) the Complainant has not authorized or somehow given consent to the Respondent to register and use the disputed domain name, (ii) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and (iii) the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name is neither a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

- The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The composition of the disputed domain name indicates that the Respondent registered it having in mind the Complainant's LONZA mark, and reflects the Respondent's clear intention to create an association with and take advantage of the Complainant's widely known trademark. Passive holding, which is the case here, demonstrates bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs the Panel to decide the Complaint based on the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable.

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out four illustrative circumstances, which for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, shall be evidence of registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy sets out three illustrative circumstances any one of which, if found by the Panel, shall be evidence of the Respondent's rights to or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy above.

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 Select 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is virtually identical to the Complainant's LONZA trademark except that the final letter "a" has been replaced with the letter "q". In the Panel's view, this is an example of an intentional misspelling of a trademark that results in a domain name that is confusingly similar to the mark, and a typical case of typosquatting. Accordingly, The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark LONZA. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

The addition of the Top-Level Domain, such as ".com", is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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 that 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.

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. There is no indication before the Panel of any activity in relation to the disputed domain name that would give rise to rights or legitimate interests to the Respondent. Also, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

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.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that according to the un rebutted evidence in the Complaint, the Complainant’s LONZA trademark has been widely used in commerce for decades well before the registration of the disputed domain name, and has, as a result, acquired considerable reputation and goodwill. The Panel also notes the Complainant’s portfolio of LONZA trademark registrations worldwide and in the United States.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name more than 100 years after the Complainant first began using the LONZA trademark and more than 50 years after that trademark was first registered in the United States. In the circumstances of the case, particularly noting the composition of the disputed domain name, it is difficult to believe that the Respondent did not have in mind the Complainant’s trademark when registering the disputed domain name. Indeed, the disputed domain name reproduces a misspelled variation of the term “LONZA”, in which the final letter “a” has been replaced by the letter “q.” This suggests that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith with a deliberate intent to create an impression of an association with the Complainant, and to mislead Internet users into believing the disputed domain name as an official domain name of the Complainant.

Prior panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos) to a well-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

As to bad faith use, the disputed domain name does not point to an active website and merely resolves to a webpage stating that the page/site cannot be reached.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name as discussed above, the failure of the Respondent to submit a response, as well as the implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put in view of the misleading nature of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of 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 <lonzq.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Anna Carabelli/

Anna Carabelli

Sole Panelist

Date: April 16, 2026