

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. Conrad Molly, Gilead Sciences
Case No. D2026-3712

1. The Parties

Complainant is Gilead Sciences, Inc., United States of America (“U.S.” or “United States”), internally represented .

Respondent is Conrad Molly, Gilead Sciences, U.S.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <gileadinvest.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Squarespace Domains II LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 19, 2026. On August 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On August 20, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 31, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 20, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on September 22, 2026.

The Center appointed Christopher S. Gibson as the sole panelist in this matter on September 28, 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

Complainant, founded in 1987 and headquartered in Foster City, California, U.S., is a biopharmaceutical company that discovers, develops, and commercializes medicines and related therapies. According to the Complaint, Complainant had worldwide revenues of approximately USD 29.4 billion in 2025 and markets pharmaceutical products in numerous countries. Complainant is a member of the S&P 500 and employs approximately 18,000 individuals worldwide.

Complainant owns numerous registrations and several pending applications for the GILEAD and GILEAD SCIENCES trademarks worldwide. An illustrative list of Complainant's GILEAD trademark registrations, includes:

- GILEAD – U.S. Trademark Reg. No. 3,251,595, registered on June 12, 2007, covering pharmaceutical preparations, in Class 5;
- GILEAD – Singapore Trademark Reg. No. T08/03446D, registered on July 24, 2008, covering pharmaceuticals in Class 5;
- GILEAD – India Trademark Reg. No. 2363685, registered on July 13, 2012, covering pharmaceutical preparations in Class 5;
- GILEAD – European Union Trademark Reg. No. 3913167, registered on November 7, 2005, covering pharmaceutical preparations in Class 5 and chemicals for use in science, scientific research and for laboratory use in Class 1, and scientific, medical, and industrial research in Class 42;
- GILEAD – China Trademark Reg. No. 816124, registered on February 21, 1996, covering pharmaceuticals for the treatment and/or prevention of diseases and related conditions in Class 5;
- GILEAD – Brazil Trademark Reg. No. 904960269, registered on July 7, 2015, covering pharmaceutical preparations in Class 5;
- GILEAD – International Trademark Reg. No. 1132718, registered on June 26, 2012, covering pharmaceutical preparations in Class 5;
- GILEAD – United Kingdom Trademark Reg. No. UK00903913167, registered on November 7, 2005, covering pharmaceutical and veterinary preparations in Class 5; and
- GILEAD – Iceland Trademark Reg. No. 456/2007, registered on April 2, 2007, covering formulations in Class 5.

Complainant is the owner of the domain name <gilead.com>, registered on May 27, 1995, which has been used by the company since as early as 1997 in connection with its pharmaceutical products and related medical services. Complainant owns numerous domain names that incorporate its GILEAD trademarks.

The Domain Name was registered on May 22, 2026. Respondent provided "Gilead Sciences" as the organization associated with the registration, and the registration information provides an address in the United States. The evidence submitted by Complainant indicates that the Domain Name has redirected Internet users to Complainant's official website at "www.gilead.com". The evidence also indicates that mail exchange ("MX") records have been configured for the Domain Name.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

First, Complainant contends that its GILEAD and GILEAD SCIENCES trademarks serve as valuable identifiers for the company and its various goods and services, pharmaceutical research, and charitable services. Through longstanding use and the success of its products, Complainant states the GILEAD name has gained significant recognition in the United States and throughout the world. Indeed, Complainant submits that the GILEAD mark is famous and well-known, citing several UDRP cases. See *Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. Hilltop City Church*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-2906](#) (recognizing GILEAD as a famous registered trademark); and *Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. Olutoyin Adeoye*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-0303](#) (finding that the GILEAD mark is well-established and known).

Complainant submits the Domain Name is confusingly similar to its GILEAD trademarks. The Domain Name incorporates the GILEAD mark, followed by the letter "s" and the term "invest". The addition of the letter 's' is a common typographical error as the letters 'd' and 's' are located side-by-side on standard keyboards. Further, the term "invest" reinforces the risk of confusion with Complainant, as Complainant is a publicly traded company, with resources available online for potential investors, and Complainant also operates an employee stock purchase plan which allows eligible employees to purchase Complainant's stock. Thus, according to Complainant, the additional letter and term do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity because the GILEAD mark remains recognizable within the Domain Name.

Second, Complainant contends that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. Complainant has not licensed or otherwise authorized Respondent to use its GILEAD mark, and Respondent is not affiliated with Complainant. Complainant has no current or former employee bearing Respondent's name and does not maintain an office or other operation at the address provided by Respondent. Complainant contends there is no evidence that Respondent is commonly known by the Domain Name or is making a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name. Complainant states that a search of the California business registry did not disclose a business named "Gileads Invest",. Complainant emphasizes that, despite having no affiliation with Complainant, Respondent identified "Gilead Sciences" as his organization when registering the Domain Name.

Complainant submits that its mark is so well known and recognized that there can be no legitimate use by Respondent. Despite this, the Domain Name has mail exchange records ("MX Records") enabled, which allow for the sending and receiving of emails. The creation of an "@gileadsinvest.com" email address by a person or entity unaffiliated with Complainant is conducive to fraudulent activity and does not create rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

Third, Complainant contends that the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. When viewing the totality of the circumstances, Complainant asserts the following acts by Respondent demonstrate bad faith registration and use of the Domain Name: (1) intentionally registering the Domain Name consisting of a common misspelling of the GILEAD trademark; (2) purposefully registering the Domain Name combining the Gilead name with the term "invest" to potentially mislead Internet users, Gilead employees, vendors, and affiliates in a phishing scheme or other scam; (3) enabling MX Records; (4) configuring the Domain Name to redirect traffic to Complainant's genuine website; and (5) registering the Domain Name incorporating Complainant's trademark without any legitimate use.

Complainant asserts Respondent registered the Domain Name, which fully incorporates the GILEAD mark together with the term "invest", a construction that strongly suggests affiliation with Complainant as it may pertain to investing opportunities or investment-related employee benefits. This construction creates a misleading impression that emails sent from a "@gileadsinvest.com" email address are genuine

communications from Complainant when that is not the case. Whether these emails are sent to potential investors in Complainant's stock, or used more generally for phishing purposes, it is unequivocal that use of the Domain Name for email will create confusion in the mind of the email recipient.

Further, Complainant contends it is well-established that using the Domain Name to redirect traffic to 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 Complainant.

Finally, Complainant submits prior UDRP panels have also held that the GILEAD mark itself is "so well-known and recognized, there can be no legitimate use by the Respondent.", citing *Gilead Sciences, Inc. v. John Cuban, Gilead Online Pharmacy*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-1254](#) (transferring <gileadonlinepharmacy.com>). At the very least, Respondent had constructive knowledge of Complainant's trademarks and its rights due to Complainant's longstanding worldwide trademark registrations covering the GILEAD and GILEAD SCIENCES marks.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

In order to succeed on its Complaint, Complainant must demonstrate that the three elements set forth in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied. These elements are:

- (i) the Domain Name registered by Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) Respondent has registered and is using the Domain Name 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 Complainant's trademark and the Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of its GILEAD trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1. The Panel finds that Complainant's well-known GILEAD mark is recognizable within the Domain Name. Although the addition of other terms – here, the letter "s" and the word "invest" – may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of these terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the GILEAD mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. Accordingly, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant's mark for the purposes of the Policy.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

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.

Here, Complainant has established a prima facie case. Complainant has not authorized Respondent to use the GILEAD mark, and there is no evidence that Respondent has been commonly known by the Domain Name. The Registrar registration information identifies Respondent as an individual while listing Respondent's organization as "Gilead Sciences". Complainant states that it has no current or former employee bearing Respondent's name, that Respondent is not affiliated with it, and that Complainant has no office or operations at the address supplied by Respondent. Nor is there evidence that, before notice of the dispute, Respondent used or made demonstrable preparations to use the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Rather, the evidence indicates that the Domain Name has redirected to Complainant's website. In the circumstances of this case, such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate non-commercial or fair use.

The Panel finds that Complainant has made out a prima facie case and the burden of production therefore shifts to Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests. In this case, Respondent has not filed a Response and has provided no evidence to rebut Complainant's prima facie showing. The Panel therefore finds that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name.

Accordingly, Complainant has established the second element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1, provides further guidance that "bad faith under the UDRP is broadly understood to occur where a respondent takes unfair advantage of or otherwise abuses a complainant's mark".

Here, the Panel finds, on the balance of the probabilities, that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith. First, the Panel finds that the circumstances of this case establish that Respondent registered the Domain Name with knowledge of and with the intention of targeting Complainant and its GILEAD trademark. Complainant's GILEAD trademark rights substantially predate the registration of the Domain Name. The Domain Name incorporates Complainant's mark together with the addition of the letter "s" and the term "invest". More significantly, when registering the Domain Name, Respondent identified his organization as "Gilead Sciences". Complainant has stated, uncontested, that Respondent has no affiliation with it and has not been authorized to use the GILEAD mark or the Gilead Sciences name. This circumstance strongly indicates that Respondent was aware of Complainant and deliberately targeted it when registering the Domain Name.

The manner in which the Domain Name has been used reinforces this conclusion. The evidence submitted by Complainant indicates that the Domain Name redirects Internet users to Complainant's genuine website. Such redirection, in the circumstances of this case, is consistent with an attempt to create or reinforce the false impression that the Domain Name is owned, operated, sponsored, or otherwise authorized by 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 redirected to the complainant-owned website).

The record further indicates that MX records have been configured for the Domain Name, meaning that the Domain Name is technically capable of being used for email. The Panel does not consider the existence of MX records, standing alone, to establish that Respondent has actually engaged in phishing or other

fraudulent email activity, and the record does not contain evidence of an actual fraudulent email sent from the Domain Name. Nevertheless, the MX configuration is relevant when considered together with the other circumstances of this case: the incorporation of Complainant's well-known and distinctive GILEAD mark into the Domain Name; the addition of the term "invest", Respondent's unauthorized identification of his organization as "Gilead Sciences", and the redirection of the Domain Name to Complainant's site.

Considering the totality of these circumstances, the Panel finds that Respondent registered the Domain Name with actual knowledge of Complainant and its trademark and with an intention to create a misleading impression of association with Complainant. The Panel further finds that Respondent's use of the Domain Name to redirect to Complainant's official website constitutes use in bad faith. Respondent has provided no explanation for its selection and use of the Domain Name and has not rebutted the evidence presented by Complainant.

In sum, based upon the record before it and the totality of the circumstances, the Panel finds that the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. Accordingly, the Panel finds that 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 Domain Name, <gileadsinvest.com>, be transferred to Complainant.

/Christopher S. Gibson/

Christopher S. Gibson

Sole Panelist

Date: October 5, 2026