ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Lonza Ltd v. chen le le, Fuzhou Ofit Trading Co., Ltd.
Case No. D2026-3526

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is chen le le, Fuzhou Ofit Trading Co., Ltd., China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <lonzafactoryart.com>, <lonzafactorycap.com>, <lonzafactorycc.com>, <lonzafactoryclikc.com>, <lonzafactoryed.com>, <lonzafactoryfin.com>, <lonzafactorynet.com>, <lonzafactoryoi.com>, <lonzafactoryone.com>, <lonzafactoryraw.com>, <lonzafactorys.com>, <lonzafactorystore.com>, <lonzafactorysut.com>, <lonzafactorytop.com>, <lonzafactoryus.com>, <lonzafactoryvip.shop>, and <lonzafactory66.com> are registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 8, 2026. On August 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On August 10, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent ("User #52036fe5 Privacy / See PrivacyGuardian.org / User #14d308d3 Privacy / See PrivacyGuardian.org / User #2be315df Privacy / See PrivacyGuardian.org / User #36d41e13 Privacy / See PrivacyGuardian.org / User #16c85866 Privacy / See PrivacyGuardian.org / User #eb0216ab Privacy / See PrivacyGuardian.org / User #4c52161f Privacy / See PrivacyGuardian.org / User #0620e381 Privacy / See PrivacyGuardian.org / User #373720ec Privacy / See PrivacyGuardian.org / User #841ea96b Privacy / See PrivacyGuardian.org / User #7c1a636b Privacy / See PrivacyGuardian.org / User #98552f09 Privacy / See PrivacyGuardian.org / User #5d1587e8 Privacy / See PrivacyGuardian.org / User #5630885b Privacy / See PrivacyGuardian.org / User #c8936137 Privacy / See PrivacyGuardian.org / User #cd7e95b3 Privacy / See PrivacyGuardian.org / User #b3e46ce9 Privacy / See PrivacyGuardian.org") and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 12, 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 amended Complaints on August 18 and 25, 2026, respectively.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 25, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 14, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Zoltán Takács as the sole panelist in this matter on September 23, 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 in this administrative proceeding is a Swiss company which is part of the Lonza Group Ltd., one of the leading companies providing manufacturing services to the pharmaceutical, biotech and nutrition markets with revenues of over CHF 6.5 billion in 2025. Founded in 1897, the Complainant has been developing and manufacturing products for pharmaceutical industry including peptides. The Complainant employs approximately 20,000 people across more than 30 sites worldwide.

The Complainant is the owner of a number of LONZA-formative trademarks in multiple jurisdictions around the world, including the International Trademark Registration No. 1204258 for the word mark LONZA registered on December 13, 2013.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <lonza.com> (registered on January 8, 1997) which resolves to its corporate website.

The disputed domain names were registered between June 14 and July 24, 2026.

The disputed domain names <lonzafactoryoi.com>, <lonzafactoryone.com>, <lonzafactorys.com>, <lonzafactorystore.com>, <lonzafactorytop.com>, and <lonzafactoryvip.shop> have been resolving to highly similar layout websites used for promotion of purported research peptides and related laboratory products.

The disputed domain names <lonzafactoryart.com>, <lonzafactorycap.com>, <lonzafactoryed.com>, <lonzafactoryfin.com>, <lonzafactorynet.com>, <lonzafactoryus.com>, and <lonzafactory66.com>, which are currently inactive, previously resolved to similar layout websites purportedly promoting various consumer goods including household items, accessories, and decorative products.

The disputed domain names <lonzafactoryraw.com> and <lonzafactorysut.com>, which are currently inactive, previously resolved to similar layout websites, purportedly selling patriotic, veteran-themed, and western-style merchandise.

The disputed domain names <lonzafactoryclikc.com> and <lonzafactorycc.com> have not been used for active websites.

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:

- the disputed domain names which incorporate the entirety of its mark with the addition of the term "factory" and followed by various other terms are confusingly similar to the mark;

- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names since it is unable to rely on any of the circumstances set out in paragraphs 4(c)(i), (ii), or (iii) of the Policy; and

- the incorporation of the Complainant's mark into the disputed domain names; the use of the Complainant's mark on the corresponding websites at the disputed domain names and the international recognition of the Complainant's mark indicate that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its rights and have targeted the Complainant and its mark through registration and use of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain names be transferred from the Respondent to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Procedural Matter – Multiple Domain Names

The Complaint was filed in relation to 17 disputed domain names registered by the same domain name registrant.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder. Due to the fact that the disputed domain names have been registered by the same Respondent, the Panel may proceed with the substantive matters of this case.

6.2 Substantive Matters – Three Elements

A complainant must evidence each of the three elements required by paragraph 4(a) of the Policy in order to succeed on the complaint, namely that:

(i) the 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 in respect of the domain names; and

(iii) the 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 Complainant's LONZA mark is reproduced and recognizable in the disputed domain names. Although the addition of other terms, here "factory", "art", "cap", "cc", "clikc", "ed", "fin", "oi", "one", "raw", "s", "store", "sut", "top", "us", "vip", "66", and "net" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that such additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 1.7 and 1.8.

The Panel finds that 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 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.

There is no relationship with or permission from the Complainant for the Respondent's use of its mark, in domain names or otherwise. There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain names within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Respondent has used the disputed domain names incorporating the Complainant's mark - save for the disputed domain names <lonzafactoryclikc.com> and <lonzafactorycc.com>, which have not been used for active websites - to deceive Internet users looking for the Complainant through directing them to its own websites used for the promotion of either research peptides similar to those manufactured and promoted by the Complainant or various other consumer goods. In either case, such use of the disputed domain names is not legitimate, as it creates a misleading impression as to source or sponsorship, and appears intended for commercial gain. In addition, the mere passive holding of the disputed domain names <lonzafactoryclikc.com> and <lonzafactorycc.com> is neither a bona fide offering of goods and services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name and cannot establish any rights or legitimate interests in these disputed domain names.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names and that 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.

Based on the available record the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith, targeting the Complainant and its trademark rights.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant's LONZA mark – which the disputed domain names all contain – predates the date of registration of the disputed domain names. Also, the LONZA mark is a wholly fanciful term with no generic or descriptive significance.

As mentioned above, the Respondent is using or has used the majority of the disputed domain names to resolve to websites that display the Complainant's mark and either promote research peptides, which are goods similar to those of the Complainant, or various other consumer goods.

Thus, in view of the Panel, it is more likely than not that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant and its LONZA mark and has registered the disputed domain names with the intention to profit from or exploit the Complainant's trademark.

Furthermore, according to WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4, mere registration of a domain name that is identical of confusingly similar to a well-known trademark – particularly in the case of coined or fanciful marks – can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. It has been established in prior decisions under the UDRP, with which the Panel agrees, that the Complainant's LONZA mark is well known. See, e.g., *Lonza Ltd.v. phillip decker,* WIPO Case No. 2024-4139.

As mentioned above, save for the disputed domain names <lonzafactoryclikc.com> and <lonzafactorycc.com>, the case record shows that at the time of filing of the Complainant, the remaining 15 disputed domain names resolved to commercial websites as described under Section 4. Above. The Panel finds that the use of these 15 disputed domain names constitutes bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Panel notes that the disputed domain names <lonzafactoryart.com>, <lonzafactorycap.com>, <lonzafactoryed.com>, <lonzafactoryfin.com>, <lonzafactorynet.com>, <lonzafactoryraw.com>, <lonzafactorysut.com>, <lonzafactoryus.com>, and <lonzafactory66.com> are currently inactive. In any case, this does not alter the Panel's conclusions, since non-use of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3. The same finding applies to the disputed domain names <lonzafactoryclikc.com> and <lonzafactorycc.com>, which has never been used based on the case record. In this context the Panel notes the high degree of inherent distinctiveness and the well-known status of the Complainant's mark; the above findings of the Respondent's bad-faith conduct; the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names and its failure to submit a response, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names <lonzafactoryclikc.com> and <lonzafactorycc.com> 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 names <lonzafactoryart.com>, <lonzafactorycap.com>, <lonzafactorycc.com>, <lonzafactoryclikc.com>, <lonzafactoryed.com>, <lonzafactoryfin.com>,

<lonzafactorynet.com>, <lonzafactoryoi.com>, <lonzafactoryone.com>, <lonzafactoryraw.com>, <lonzafactorys.com>, <lonzafactorystore.com>, <lonzafactorysut.com>, <lonzafactorytop.com>, <lonzafactoryus.com>, <lonzafactoryvip.shop>, and <lonzafactory66.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Zoltán Takács/
Zoltán Takács
Sole Panelist
Date: October 3, 2026