

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lonza Ltd v. Milan Spasenovic, Milan Spasenovic PR
Case No. DCO2025-0101

1. The Parties

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

Respondent is Milan Spasenovic, Milan Spasenovic PR, Serbia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lonza.co> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 15, 2025. On December 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On December 17, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (UNAVAILABLE/REDACTED FOR PRIVACY / Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on December 17, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on December 20, 2025.

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 12, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on January 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Dinant T. L. Oosterbaan as the sole panelist in this matter on January 19, 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 Lonza Ltd, which is part of the Lonza Group Ltd. is one of the leading companies providing manufacturing services to the pharmaceutical, biotech and nutrition markets with revenues of over USD 6.5 billion in 2024. At least as early as 1913, Complainant adopted and has continuously used the trademark LONZA in the pharmaceutical, biotechnology and nutrition space, in addition to other areas, such as custom manufacturing.

Complainant owns multiple trademarks for LONZA, including European Union wordmark LONZA, registration number 001101898 and registration date July 3, 2000.

Complainant also incorporates the LONZA trademark as part of its company name and operates its website using the domain name <lonza.com>.

The Domain Name was registered on November 6, 2025. The Domain Name redirects to a Registrar's website where it is offered for sale for USD 5,000.

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.

Notably, Complainant contends that the Domain Name is identical and confusingly similar to its LONZA trademark. Complainant submits that the Domain Name comprises Complainant's LONZA trademark in its entirety with the addition of the country-code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".co". Relevant consumers will likely be and have already been confused into believing that there is a connection of source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement between Complainant's LONZA trademark and Respondent by Respondent's use of the Domain Name.

According to Complainant, Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Complainant asserts that it has not authorized, by license or otherwise, Respondent to use the LONZA trademark or brand, or to apply for any domain name that is confusingly similar to such mark. To the contrary, Respondent is using the LONZA trademark to falsely hold itself out as being associated with Complainant primarily for the purpose of selling it either to Complainant or to third persons for valuable consideration in excess of the documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the Domain Name. Respondent's actions in connection with the Domain Name are not a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name.

Complainant submits that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith. According to Complainant the LONZA trademark has been the subject of subsisting trademark registrations for more than 100 years in over 30 countries. It is highly implausible that Respondent was unaware of Complainant and Complainant's LONZA mark at the time that the Domain Name was registered.

According to Complainant the Domain Name, which is identical to the LONZA trademark, redirects to a website where it is offered for sale at a price of USD 5,000. This price likely exceeds the usual out-of-pocket costs related to the registration of a domain name, especially considering that the Domain Name has only been registered since November 6, 2025. Given the worldwide recognition of Complainant's LONZA trademarks, the lack of evidence of any good faith use by Respondent, the fact that Respondent is offering to sell the Domain Name for an amount in excess of its out-of-pocket costs, and that Respondent has taken steps to conceal its identity, it is not possible to conceive of any plausible actual or contemplated active use of the Domain Name by Respondent that would not be illegitimate, such as by being a passing off, an infringement of consumer protection legislation, or an infringement of Complainant's rights. The totality of the circumstances establishes that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs the Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable".

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that a complainant proves each of the following three elements to obtain an order that the disputed domain name should be transferred or cancelled:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights; and
- (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

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the LONZA mark is reproduced within the Domain Name. Accordingly, the Domain Name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The ccTLD ".co" is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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 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 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Respondent has not rebutted Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Complainant has not licensed or otherwise permitted Respondent to use its LONZA trademark or to register the Domain Name incorporating its mark. Respondent is also not commonly known by the Domain Name, nor has it acquired any trademark rights. Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademarks of Complainant. Based on the undisputed submission and evidence provided by Complainant, the Panel notes that the Domain Name is used to redirect to a website offering the Domain Name for sale at the price of USD 5,000. Considering the lack of any Response putting forward a legitimate non-infringing purpose, in the Panel’s view, it is reasonable to infer that by offering the Domain Name for sale Respondent has intended to capitalize on the reputation and goodwill inherent in Complainant’s LONZA trademark.

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.

The Panel finds that the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. Noting the status of the well-known LONZA mark and the overall circumstances of this case, the Panel finds it more likely than not that Respondent knew or should have known Complainant’s LONZA mark and targeted it when registering the Domain Name. The registration of the Domain Name in awareness of the LONZA trademark and in the absence of rights or legitimate interests amounts under these circumstances to registration in bad faith.

The circumstances mentioned in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy include circumstances indicating that Respondent has registered or acquired the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the disputed domain name registration to Complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of Respondent’s documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Domain Name incorporates Complainant's trademark in its entirety and is identical thereto. The Panel also notes that the Domain Name is used to redirect to a parked website offering the Domain Name for sale at the price of USD 5,000. The Panel considers this amount likely in excess of Respondent's out-of-pocket costs directly related to the Domain Name. Respondent has made no other use of the Domain Name. Accordingly, these circumstances fall within the terms of paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy.

The Panel therefore concludes that the Domain Name is registered and has been used in bad faith. The Panel finally notes that Respondent did not rebut Complainant's contentions.

The Panel finds that the third element of the Policy has been established.

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, <lonza.co>, be transferred to Complainant.

/Dinant T. L. Oosterbaan/

Dinant T. L. Oosterbaan

Sole Panelist

Date: January 26, 2026