

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lonza Ltd. v. Henry Dun, webdesignd
Case No. D2026-3087

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Lonza Ltd., Switzerland, represented by GBC Law, United States of America.

The Respondent is Henry Dun, webdesignd, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lonza.sbs> is registered with HOSTINGER operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 14, 2026. On July 14, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 14, 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 Registrant) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 15, 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 July 31, 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 August 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 26, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 3, 2026.

The Center appointed Adam Samuel as the sole panelist in this matter on September 18, 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 Swiss company providing manufacturing services to the pharmaceutical, biotech, and nutrition markets. The Complainant owns a number of United States of America trademarks for LONZA, including registration number 0956300, registered on April 3, 1973. The Complainant's corporate group markets its services through the domain name <lonza.com>, registered on January 8, 1997.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 28, 2026. It resolves to the Complainant's website.

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 comprises the Complainant's trademark LONZA and the generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) ".sbs." Relevant consumers will probably be and have already been confused into believing that there is a connection of source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement between the Complainant's LONZA trademark and the Respondent. The addition of a gTLD does not prevent a finding that a domain name is identical to a complainant's trademark.

The Respondent does not own a trademark registration for LONZA and has not applied for one. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the LONZA trademark or brand or to use any domain name that is confusingly similar to such a mark. Using the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to the Complainant's own website does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

The Respondent's redirection of the disputed domain name to the Complainant's website proves that the Respondent knew when it registered the disputed domain name of the Complainant and its LONZA trademark.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied:

- (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.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's trademark and the gTLD ".sbs."

The gTLD is irrelevant here as it is a standard registration requirement. See section 1.11.1 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)").

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Based on the available record, the Respondent is not called or commonly known as "LONZA" or anything similar. There is no evidence that the Complainant has ever authorised the Respondent to use its trademarks or that the Respondent has made a bona fide offering or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. For these reasons, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has met this element. See section 2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Immediately after registering the disputed domain name, the Respondent diverted the website to which it resolved to that of the Complainant. It continues to do so. The Respondent clearly knew of the Complainant and its business when it registered the disputed domain name.

Without a response to the Complaint, it is impossible to identify the Respondent's motives for doing this. The Respondent may have intended to sell the disputed domain name to the Complainant at a profit or attempt to attract for some form of commercial gain Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark. These are examples of bad faith registration and use.

Where the Respondent is clearly aware of the Complainant's trademark and is essentially doing nothing with the disputed domain name except diverting Internet users to the Complainant's website, it is passively holding the disputed domain name in bad faith: [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. At the very least, the Panel cannot identify any good faith reasons for the Respondent's behaviour.

For all these reasons, 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 <lonza.sbs> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Adam Samuel/

Adam Samuel

Sole Panelist

Date: September 18, 2026