

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. Name Redacted  
Case No. D2026-1957

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Gilead Sciences, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), internally represented.

The Respondent is Name Redacted.<sup>1</sup>

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <gilead.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 May 6, 2026. On May 6, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 6, 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 (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 May 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 and an amended Complaint on May 7, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint and 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”).

---

<sup>1</sup> The record indicates that the name and contact details used for this registration belong to a third party who appears to have been listed without that person’s knowledge or authorization. Considering this potential identity theft, the Panel directs that the Respondent’s name be omitted from the published version of this Decision. An annex containing instructions to the Registrar, including the registrant data needed to implement this Decision, is authorized for transmission to the Registrar only and shall not be published, having regard to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See, e.g., *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 28, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Gary Saposnik as the sole panelist in this matter on May 29, 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 a biopharmaceutical company that was founded in 1987 in California, United States. In 2025, the Complainant's total worldwide revenue was approximately USD 29.4 billion. In 2025, it was listed as no. 149 in the Fortune 500 Companies rankings. The Complainant develops, manufactures, and offers for sale over 25 pharmaceutical products, including products which prevent or treat HIV infection or products which cure hepatitis C. The Complainant's products also include the COVID-19 treatment product VEKLURY (remdesivir), which was authorized for emergency use by the United States Food and Drug Administration ("FDA") in 2020. The Complainant is a member of the S&P 500 and employs approximately 18,000 individuals worldwide.

The Complainant is the registrant of numerous trademarks for GILEAD worldwide, including the following registrations:

- GILEAD, United States Reg. No. 3251595, registered on June 12, 2007, in Class 5, for "pharmaceutical preparations, namely, antivirals, antifungals and preparations for the treatment of infectious conditions";
- GILEAD, European Union Trade Mark No. 003913167, registered on November 7, 2005, in Classes 1, 5, and 42, including for "pharmaceutical and veterinary preparations; chemical, analytical and diagnostic reagents for in vivo use; chemicals for use in medical research, and medical or veterinary diagnosis";
- GILEAD, China Reg. No. 816124, registered on February 21, 1996, in Class 5, for "pharmaceuticals for the treatment and/or prevention of infectious diseases, cardiovascular and inflammatory conditions, degenerative disorders, and cancer"

The Complainant is the registrant 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 disputed domain name was registered on January 12, 2026. The disputed domain name currently resolves to an error page indicating that the website is inaccessible. The Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name is being used in emails in furtherance of a fraudulent phishing scheme.

#### **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 identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's well-known GILEAD mark. The disputed domain name contains the Complainant's GILEAD mark in its entirety, merely swapping the letters "i" and "l" in an act of typosquatting. A domain name consisting of a common or intentional misspelling is considered to be confusingly similar to the relevant

mark. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 1.9. See also *Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. Ivy Jon*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-0699](#).

The Complainant avers that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not associated or affiliated with the Complainant. The Complainant has not granted any rights to the Respondent to use the GILEAD mark, whether a license to sell any products or offer any services, or any rights to register the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Rather, the Respondent used the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant in fraudulent emails to third parties. The use of a domain name for illegal activity such as fraud, impersonation, and phishing can never confer rights or legitimate interests. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.

Lastly, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent intentionally registered the disputed domain name consisting solely of the GILEAD mark, with the letters “i” and “l” purposely switched to create a common misspelling. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to configure email servers to enable the Respondent to send emails impersonating the Complainant, its employees, and its authorized representatives. The Respondent is further using the disputed domain name to send fraudulent emails impersonating the Complainant to third parties. Additionally, the Respondent has used a privacy shield in its registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant claims that prior WIPO panels have also held that the GILEAD mark itself is “so well known and recognized, there can be no legitimate use by the Respondent.” See *Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. John Cuban, Gilead Online Pharmacy*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-1254](#).

## **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 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 GILEAD mark is recognizable 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. In the present case, the disputed domain name transposes the “i” and “l” in the Complainant’s GILEAD mark. A domain name which consists of a variation of a trademark, including an obvious or intentional misspelling, referred to as typosquatting, is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for the purposes of the first element. The Respondent’s intentional misspelling of the GILEAD mark in the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

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.

In the present case, the Complainant has provided evidence that a third-party healthcare professional had received an email communication from the disputed domain name, supposedly intended for the Complainant’s employees, which informs the recipients of an alleged phishing attempt.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, phishing, identity theft, or other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name more than 30 years after the Complainant attained trademark rights in its GILEAD mark.

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.

The Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name that is nearly identical to the Complainant’s distinctive and well-known mark, but with the minor variation of inverted letters. See *Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. Fahima Tagzirt*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-2790](#). The Complainant’s mark is so well-known and recognized, there can be no legitimate use by the Respondent. See *Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. John Cuban, Gilead Online Pharmacy*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-1254](#).

As noted above, the Complainant provided evidence that the Respondent sent emails in a fraudulent attempt to impersonate the Complainant or its employees in a phishing scheme or other scam. While the Respondent’s use of a privacy service, in itself, may not be evidence of bad faith, in this case such use along with the Respondent’s apparent use of underlying contact details of a third party in an attempt to shield its identity is another indication of bad faith registration and use.

Additionally, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, phishing, identity theft, or other types of fraud, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name containing an intentional misspelling, the Respondent's use of a phishing scheme in emails, as well as apparent identity theft to hide its contact details, and finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute 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 <gliead.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Gary Saposnik/*

**Gary Saposnik**

Sole Panelist

Date: May 29, 2026