

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. Ramos Terence
Case No. D2026-3588

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Ramos Terence, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <gileadsceinces.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 12, 2026. On August 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 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 (Privacy User #6e4987e2, See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 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 August 18, 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 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Clark W. Lackert as the sole panelist in this matter on September 16, 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, Gilead Sciences, Inc., is a major biopharmaceutical company founded in 1987 in Foster City, California, United States. It discovers, develops, manufactures, and commercializes medicines addressing unmet medical needs, using its primary trademarks GILEAD and GILEAD SCIENCES, hereinafter referred to collectively as the “Marks”. In 2025, the Complainant reported worldwide revenue of approximately USD 29.4 billion and ranked 154th in the Fortune 500. It is a member of the S&P 500 and, according to the Complaint, employs approximately 18,000 people worldwide. It has also appeared in Forbes’ World’s Best Employers rankings.

The Complainant offers more than 25 pharmaceutical products, including BIKTARVY for HIV treatment, TRUVADA for HIV treatment or prevention, and EPCLUSA and HARVONI for the treatment of hepatitis C. In 2025, it launched YEZTUGO (lenacapavir), an FDA-approved, twice-yearly injectable for HIV prevention, following the Phase 3 PURPOSE 1 and PURPOSE 2 clinical trials. Its products also include VEKLURY (remdesivir), a COVID-19 treatment that received FDA emergency use authorization in 2020 and subsequently received full approval. The Complainant and its products have received extensive coverage in publications including The New York Times, The Wall Street Journal, and The Washington Post, as well as on national television and radio. Its COVID-19 treatment attracted further public attention during the pandemic.

The Complainant has registered its Marks throughout the world, including in the following jurisdictions:

Country	Trademark	Registration Number	Registration Date
United States	GILEAD	3251595	June 12, 2007
United States	GILEAD SCIENCES	1611838	September 4, 1990
Mexico	GILEAD SCIENCES	462911	June 9, 1994
European Union	GILEAD	3913167	November 7, 2005

The principal domain name of the Complainant, <gilead.com>, was registered on May 27, 1995, and has been used since as early as 1997 in connection with its pharmaceutical products and related medical services. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on July 29, 2026. The disputed domain name redirects to the Complainant’s official website at “www.gilead.com”, and an email address associated with the disputed domain name was also used in an online contact form submission purporting to be from an employee of the Complainant and requesting a quote for 162 Lenovo laptops.

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.

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights.

The disputed domain name incorporates the GILEAD mark in its entirety and is a misspelling of the GILEAD SCIENCES mark, swapping the letters “i” and “e” in the word “sciences”, which is typosquatting. Despite the intentional misspelling, the Complainant’s Marks remain clearly and immediately recognizable in the disputed domain name.

Typosquatting does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity where the Complainant’s mark remains clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name. Previous panel decisions affirm that minor variations of the GILEAD mark are confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark. See *Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. Fahima Tagzirt*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-2790](#) (transferring <gileasd.com>); *Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. Xing Wang*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-3274](#) (transferring <gileads.info>); and *Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. Super Privacy Service TLD c/o Dynadot / Xing Wang*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-3210](#) (transferring <gileads.net>).

The Complainant submits that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name containing an intentional misspelling of the GILEAD SCIENCES mark more than thirty years after the Complainant entered the biopharmaceutical/healthcare industry. It further submits that the Respondent willfully adopted a misspelling of that mark within the disputed domain name in an attempt to unfairly capitalize on the valuable goodwill the Complainant has built in its trademarks in furtherance of impersonation and fraud for the Respondent's own commercial gain.

Accordingly, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its Marks.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant states that the Respondent is not associated or affiliated with it. The Complainant has not granted any rights to the Respondent to use the Marks, including any license to sell products or offer services under the Marks, or any authorization to register the disputed domain name. The Complainant submits that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of it. The Respondent's alleged use of the disputed domain name to impersonate an employee of the Complainant to potentially defraud third parties does not constitute a legitimate interest. Panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activities, including phishing, impersonation, and other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 2.13.1. See also *CMA CGM v. Diana Smith*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-1774](#) (a phishing scam cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name).

The Complainant also cites a prior UDRP panel decision recognizing that the Complainant's GILEAD trademark is "long established, highly valuable and globally registered" and that it is a "famous registered trademark." See *Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot / Kolawole Feyisitan*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-3517](#). In ordering transfer of <gileadafrica.com>, that panel found no conceivable bona fide use of that domain name for a website or email address that would not conflict with the Complainant's legitimate use of its trademark.

The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant contends that the following circumstances, viewed together, demonstrate bad faith registration and use: (1) intentionally registering the disputed domain name incorporating GILEAD wholly within the disputed domain name and the GILEAD SCIENCES mark, with the letters "i" and "e" purposely switched in the word "sciences" to create a common misspelling; (2) using the disputed domain name to send deceptive communications to third parties requesting price quotes for laptops; (3) impersonating an employee of the Complainant in such communications; (4) registering the disputed domain name incorporating a misspelling of the Complainant's trademark without any legitimate use; (5) configuring the disputed domain name to redirect traffic to the Complainant's genuine website; and (6) the use of a privacy shield.

The Complainant submits that using a disputed domain name to redirect traffic to the Complainant's own website is further evidence of bad faith, as it may lead recipients of deceptive communications to believe such communications were genuinely from the Complainant. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4. See also *International Business Machines Corporation (IBM) v. Tyler Dikman*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2376](#) (finding bad faith where the domain name at issue redirected to a complainant-owned website). Prior UDRP decisions have recognized the reputation of the GILEAD mark, including *Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. Hilltop City Church*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-2906](#), which described the mark as well-known and established.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name containing a common misspelling of the GILEAD SCIENCES mark is evidence of bad faith. See *Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. Fahima Tagzirt*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-2790](#) (finding the respondent's registration of the domain name <gileasd.com> to be an act of typosquatting and thus evidence of bad faith). For all of the foregoing reasons, the Complainant submits that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, satisfying paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, and requests transfer under paragraph 4(i) of the Policy.

B. Respondent

The Respondent is in default and 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 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 GILEAD mark is reproduced in its entirety within the disputed domain name, and the GILEAD SCIENCES mark remains recognizable despite the transposition of the letters "i" and "e" in "sciences". Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's Marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

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 Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its Marks, and the record does not indicate that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The use described in the Complaint—sending communications impersonating an employee of the Complainant—does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. In *CMA CGM v. Diana Smith*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-1774](#), the panel held that an email phishing scam "cannot be considered a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use".

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 inclusion of the full famous trademark GILEAD within the disputed domain name, the deliberate misspelling of the GILEAD SCIENCES mark, the communications impersonating an employee of the Complainant to request laptop quotations, and the redirection to the Complainant's genuine website support the inference that the Respondent knew of and targeted the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name. Taken together, these circumstances support a finding of bad faith registration and use under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. Redirection to the Complainant's genuine website does not negate that finding and may reinforce the misleading appearance of affiliation. See *International Business Machines Corporation (IBM) v. Tyler Dikman*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2376](#).

Panels have held that using a domain name to send deceptive emails impersonating a complainant can constitute bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute 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 <gileadsceinces.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Clark W. Lackert/

Clark W. Lackert

Sole Panelist

Date: September 21, 2026