

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Novartis AG v. Scott Kennedy, Replit
Case No. D2026-2322

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Novartis AG, Switzerland, represented by MSA IP - Milojevic Sekulic & Associates, Serbia.

The Respondent is Scott Kennedy, Replit, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <leqvio.info>, and <leqvio.site> are registered with Name.com, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 29, 2026. On May 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 1, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 4, 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 amended Complaint on June 8, 2026.

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 June 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 29, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 3, 2026.

The Center appointed Ada L. Redondo Aguilera as the sole panelist in this matter on July 8, 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 was created in 1996 through a merger of Ciba-Geigy and Sandoz.

The Complainant is a world pharmaceutical leader based in Switzerland that provides innovative healthcare solutions to address the evolving needs of patients and societies worldwide. The Complainant's global pharmaceuticals portfolio includes more than 20 key marketed products, many of which are innovative leaders in their therapeutic areas, such as cardiometabolic indications, immunology, neuroscience, and oncology.

The Complainant has more than 30 manufacturing sites worldwide and major facilities in the United States, Europe, and Asia. Its products are available in approximately 120 countries around the world, reaching more than 300 million patients globally in 2025 alone.

The Complainant is the owner of the LEQVIO trademark according to the following information:

- 1) Switzerland Trademark Registration Number 666037, LEQVIO, registered on November 11, 2014; expiration date October 31, 2034;
- 2) International Registration Number 1229713, LEQVIO, registered on November 11, 2014; expiration date November 11, 2034;
- 3) European Union Trademark Registration Number 013423694, LEQVIO, registered on March 11, 2015; expiration date October 31, 2034;
- 4) United Kingdom Trademark Registration Number UK00913423694, LEQVIO, registered on March 11, 2015; expiration date October 31, 2034;
- 5) United States Registration Number 5640111, LEQVIO, registered on the January 1, 2019; expiration date November 11, 2034.

LEQVIO is a trademark of Complainant's pharmaceutical product, which has been recognized as one of the Complainant's key marketed products in its 2025 Annual Report, and currently features among the Complainant's key growth drivers and top 20 best-selling brands, with 2025 net sales reported at USD 1.2 billion.

The Complainant operates the domain name <leqvio.com>, registered on May 22, 2014, which displays its official website.

The Respondent is Scott Kennedy, Replit, United States.

The disputed domain name <leqvio.info> was registered on August 1, 2025.
The disputed domain name <leqvio.site> was registered on August 17, 2025.

The record shows that the disputed domain names resolved to websites displaying the LEQVIO trademark and containing online patient registration forms requesting personal and medical information in connection with LEQVIO treatment.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that both of the disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's trademark in its entirety; therefore, the disputed domain names are identical to the Complainant's LEQVIO trademark; the only difference is the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"). The Complainant's mark remains clearly recognizable within the two disputed domain names.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests regarding the disputed domain names. According to the Complainant, the Respondent has not made any legitimate or fair use of the disputed domain names. The Complainant further alleges that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith. The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain names to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

In order to succeed in its Complaint, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (i) the disputed domain names are 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 with respect to the disputed domain names; and (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

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 names. 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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, both of the disputed domain names are identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The gTLD ".info" and ".site" in the disputed domain names are disregarded for purposes of this comparison. [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 towards the two disputed domain names. 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 names, such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

As established above, this Panel finds that in particular: The Respondent is not affiliated with, nor authorized by, the Complainant to use the LEQVIO mark and that the Respondent does not hold any trademark rights in LEQVIO. There is also no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the name LEQVIO or by the disputed domain names ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.3).

There is no evidence before the Panel that the Respondent has been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to use the LEQVIO trademark or to register both of the domain names incorporating that trademark. Likewise, nothing in the record suggests that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain names.

The evidence further shows that the disputed domain names resolved to websites that prominently displayed the LEQVIO trademark and featured content specifically relating to the Complainant’s pharmaceutical product. The websites included patient registration forms, references to healthcare providers, and medical information associated with LEQVIO treatment.

In the circumstances of this case, the Panel considers that such use is not consistent with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Rather, the overall presentation of the websites as submitted in the Complaint conveyed the impression that they were operated by, affiliated with, or authorized by the Complainant.

Nor does the record support a finding that the Respondent has made a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names without intent to mislead Internet users.

The Respondent elected not to participate in this proceeding and has therefore failed to rebut the Complainant’s prima facie showing.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the second element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. Panels have held that the use of the disputed domain names for illegitimate activity, such as applicable to this case: copycat sites, passing off, 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 was aware of the Complainant and its LEQVIO trademark when registering the disputed domain names.

The composition of the disputed domain names, together with the content formerly displayed on the associated websites, provides no plausible basis to conclude that the Respondent selected the disputed domain names by coincidence.

The disputed domain names reproduce the Complainant's distinctive LEQVIO trademark in its entirety. The record further reflects that the corresponding websites prominently displayed the Complainant's trademark while offering content specifically related to LEQVIO treatment, including patient registration forms and medical information directly associated with the Complainant's pharmaceutical product.

In these circumstances, the Panel considers it implausible that the Respondent selected the disputed domain names independently or without knowledge of the Complainant's trademark rights.

The manner in which the Respondent operated the disputed domain names intentionally created a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the associated websites. Internet users encountering the disputed domain names would reasonably expect them to resolve to websites operated or authorized by the Complainant, particularly in view of the composition and nature of the content displayed.

The Panel considers that the Respondent used the disputed domain names to impersonate the Complainant by reproducing the Complainant's trademark and presenting websites requesting patient information and apparently connected with LEQVIO treatment. Such conduct demonstrates an intent to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement and falls within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Respondent has not provided any explanation for its registration or use of the disputed domain names, and the Panel identifies no circumstances in the record that would support a finding of good-faith registration or use.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed as applicable to this case: copycat sites, passing off, or other types of fraud, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes 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 names <leqvio.info> and <leqvio.site> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ada L. Redondo Aguilera/

Ada L. Redondo Aguilera

Sole Panelist

Date: July 21, 2026