

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lonza Ltd v. he jxing
Case No. D2026-2483

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is he jxing, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lonzausa.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 June 9, 2026. On June 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 10, 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, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 11, 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 June 17, 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 June 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 15, 2026.

The Center appointed Federica Togo as the sole panelist in this matter on July 27, 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

It results from the Complainant's undisputed allegations that the Complainant, which is part of the Lonza Group Ltd, is one of the leading companies providing manufacturing services to the pharmaceutical, biotech and nutrition markets.

The Complainant is the registered owner of several trademarks for LONZA, e.g., United States trademark registration No. 4,922,144 for LONZA (word) registered on March 22, 2016, for services in classes 40, 41 and 42; and United States trademark registration No. 5,222,498 for LONZA, registered on June 13, 2017, for services in classes 40 and 42.

Complainant also incorporates the LONZA trademark as part of its company name and uses the domain name <lonza.com> for its official website.

The disputed domain name <lonzausa.com> was registered on May 18, 2026. Furthermore, the undisputed evidence provided by the Complainant proves that the disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying without authorization the Complainant's trademark and allegedly offering chemical, biotech, and pharmaceutical goods and services using the LONZA trademarks.

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 and confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark since it comprises the Complainant's LONZA trademark in the entirety with the addition of the geographic term "usa" and the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ".com".

The Complainant further contends that the LONZA trademark is distinctive and closely identified with the Complainant and has achieved tremendous fame and recognition.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. According to the Complainant, it has not authorized, by license or otherwise, the Respondent to use the LONZA trademark or brand, or to apply for any domain name that is confusingly similar to such mark using the domain name or brand. To the contrary, the Respondent is using the LONZA trademark to falsely hold itself out as being associated with the Complainant and the Complainant's products causing confusion. The Respondent is wholly appropriating the Complainant's mark and is using the disputed domain name in connection with an active website that is using infringing and counterfeit copies of the LONZA trademarks to sell unauthorized goods and services.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to the Complainant, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement. The Complainant incorporates the LONZA trademark in its name and is one of the leading companies providing manufacturing services to the pharmaceutical, biotech and nutrition markets. The Complainant's LONZA trademark has been the subject of subsisting trademark registrations for more than 100 years in over 30 countries. Accordingly, the Complainant's LONZA trademark is famous.

The disputed domain name is connected to a website selling unauthorized chemical, biotech, and pharmaceutical goods and services using the LONZA trademark. This is significant evidence of bad faith and lack of rights or legitimate interests. It is highly implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and the Complainant's LONZA trademark at the time that the disputed domain name was registered. Given the Complainant's rights in the LONZA trademark, the fame and international recognition of the LONZA trademark, and the Respondent's use of the Complainant's LONZA trademark in the disputed domain name, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its rights in the LONZA trademark.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable". Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires a complainant to prove each of the following three elements in order to obtain an order that each disputed domain name be transferred or cancelled:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
- (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.

The Panel will therefore proceed to analyze whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied.

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 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 "usa" - 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 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.

Moreover, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name contains the Complainant’s registered trademark and a geographic abbreviation (“usa”). The nature of this disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation: in fact, geographic terms (e.g., <trademark-usa.com>, or <trademark.nyc>) are typically seen as tending to suggest sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner, see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) at section 2.5.1. Panels have also held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed 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.

One of these circumstances is that the Respondent, by using the disputed domain name, has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or online location or of a product or service on its website or online location (paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy).

In the present case, the Panel notes that it results from the Complainant’s documented allegations that the disputed domain name resolves to a website displaying without authorization the Complainant’s registered trademark and allegedly offering similar services to those marketed by the Complainant.

By the time the disputed domain name was registered, the Panel considers it to be unlikely that the Respondent did not have knowledge of the Complainant and its mark, which is entirely included in the disputed domain name, together with the additional geographic term referring to the United States. Consequently, and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the Panel is convinced that the Respondent knew that the disputed domain name included the Complainant’s trademark when it registered the disputed domain name.

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 the following:

- (i) the nature of the disputed domain name (wholly incorporating the Complainant's trademark plus the geographic abbreviation "usa";
- (ii) the content of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves (i.e., displaying without authorization the Complainant's registered trademark and allegedly offering similar services to those marketed by the Complainant);
- (iii) a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no substantive response and explanation for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name; and
- (iv) the Respondent concealing its identity through a privacy service.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed 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 name 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 name <lonzausa.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Federica Togo/

Federica Togo

Sole Panelist

Date: August 10, 2026