

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lonza Ltd v. Jason Adler
Case No. D2026-2670

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Jason Adler, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <uk-lonza.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 June 19, 2026. On June 19, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 19, 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 June 22, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint.

The Center verified that 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 July 1, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 21, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 22, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrea Jaeger-Lenz as the sole panelist in this matter on July 24, 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 is engaged in manufacturing services to the pharmaceutical, biotech and nutrition industries and generated revenues of more than USD 6.5 billion in 2025 (as per Annex B with Exhibit 1 to the Complaint). The brand LONZA has been adopted and used for these activities since 1913. The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations around the world consisting of or containing LONZA, including the following (as per Annex B, Exhibit 2 to the Complaint):

- United Kingdom trademark No. 777775 LONZA (word), registered on May 16, 1958 for goods in Classes 1, 2,3, 5 and 6;
- United States trademark No. 72346919 LONZA (word), registered on April 3, 1973 for goods in Class 5;
- European Union trademark No. 001101898 LONZA (word), registered on July 3, 2000 for goods in Classes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 16, 17 and 19.

The Complainant owns domain name <lonza.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 29, 2026. Before filing the present Complaint, it resolved to an active website, the access to which is shown as blocked due to its classification as “Phishing & Fraud” by the Complainant’s internal Information Technology (“IT”) security mechanism (as per Annex B, Exhibit 5).

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 rights in the trademark LONZA which substantially predates the creation of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name, according to the Complainant, comprises the Complainant’s trademark in its entirety, with the addition of the generic term “uk-“ and the addition of the generic Top-Level-Domain (“gTLD”) “.com”. Accordingly, the Complainant argues, the relevant consumer is likely to be confused into believing that there is a connection between the Complainant and the disputed domain name.

On the second element, the Complainant claims that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Firstly, the term LONZA is not a registered trademark of the Complainant. Secondly, the Complainant has not authorized or licensed the Respondent to use its trademark within the disputed domain name. Further, the disputed domain name redirects to a website, which is blocked due to a security warning that it possibly includes a threat of viruses and malware. This, so the Complainant argues, implies that the disputed domain name is used for an illegal activity such as distributing malware which can never confer legitimate rights on the Respondent.

On the third element, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. For this, the Complainant points to its revenues of more than USD 6.5 billion and argues that its trademark is well-known as it has been used for decades and the Complainant and its group of companies are one of the leading companies providing manufacturing services for the pharmaceutical, biotech and nutrition markets. Further, the selection of the generic addition of “uk-” is not a coincidence, as the Complainant conducts a significant business with over USD 260 million in 2025 in the United Kingdom. This, according to the Complainant, shows that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant upon registration of the disputed domain name. On use in bad faith, the Complainant finds that the redirect of the disputed domain name to a website, the access to which was blocked due to a possible security threat of viruses and malware shows that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in bad faith to divert Internet users for its own gain or fraudulent purposes by creating confusion with the Complainant’s trademark.

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 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, “uk-”, 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.

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 has registered the disputed domain name composed of the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, only adding the geographic prefix "uk-" for the United Kingdom. The disputed domain name was used to redirect to a website, the actual content of which unknown, but the access to which was blocked due to classification as "Phishing & Fraud" by the Complainant's internal IT security mechanism.

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 nature of the disputed domain name, consisting of the Complainant's trademark together with the geographical reference to the United Kingdom, in which the Complainant carries out business, shows a targeting of the Complainant by the Respondent upon creation of the disputed domain name.

Whether or not the classification by the Complainant's IT security of the website, to which the disputed domain name redirected, was correct, and whether or not Respondent, through this website, was actually engaged in spreading viruses and malware, is immaterial in the present case. Even if the disputed domain name had not been used at all by the Respondent, a finding of registration and use in bad faith were appropriate in the present case. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) 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 inherent distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, together with the absence of any potential good faith use, and finds that there is no plausible good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put. Thus, 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 <uk-lonza.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Jaeger-Lenz/

Andrea Jaeger-Lenz

Sole Panelist

Date: July 30, 2026