

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. David Czinczenheim, prnator.com
Case No. D2026-3100

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is David Czinczenheim, prnator.com, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <gilead-us.com> is registered with Namesalacarte.com LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 15, 2026. On July 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 17, 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 (Perfect Privacy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 28, 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 28, 2026.

On July 28, 2026, the Respondent sent an email communication to the Center stating "Hello, I can transfer the domain in case of needed". On the same day, the Complainant confirmed that it would like to proceed with panel appointment.

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 proceeding commenced on July 29, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 18, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any formal response. Accordingly, the Center informed the Parties that it would proceed with panel appointment on August 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Sebastian M.W. Hughes as the sole panelist in this matter on August 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

A. Complainant

The Complainant is a publicly traded biopharmaceutical company founded in the United States in 1987, carrying on business globally under the trade mark GILEAD (the "Trade Mark"). The Complainant operates its official website at the domain name <gilead.com>.

The Complainant is the owner of registrations in jurisdictions worldwide for the Trade Mark, including United States registration No. 3,251,595, with a registration date of June 12, 2007; and European Union registration No. 3913167, with a registration date of November 7, 2005.

B. Respondent

According to the Registrar's verification, the Respondent is an individual located in France.

C. The Disputed Domain Name

The disputed domain name <gilead-us.com> was registered on June 4, 2025.

D. Use of the Disputed Domain Name

The disputed domain name is resolved to a domain name sales website hosted by GoDaddy, where it was previously offered for sale for a Buy now price of USD 995.

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.

B. Respondent

Apart from the email communication of July 28, 2026, the Respondent did not formally 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 trade mark 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 trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Trade 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, "us") 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.

In addition, the Panel finds that the addition of the term "us" after the Trade Mark in the disputed domain name may lead Internet users to believe that the disputed domain name is connected with the Complainant and resolves to the Complainant's website for the United States.

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, considering the distinctiveness and reputation of the prior registered Trade Mark, and the use of the disputed domain name for a website offering it for sale as described under section 4, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(i) of 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 <gilead-us.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Sebastian M.W. Hughes/

Sebastian M.W. Hughes

Sole Panelist

Date: September 7, 2026