Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108264

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108264
Time of filing	2025-12-29 10:06:32
Domain names	novartis-global.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Novartis AG

Complainant representative

Organization	Abion GmbH

Respondent

Name	Sanjay Nirwan

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings which are pending or decided and which relate to the disputed domain name <novartis-global.com>.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

Novartis AG (the "Complainant") is the owner of the well-known registered trademark **NOVARTIS**, protected in numerous jurisdictions worldwide, including India, where the Respondent is apparently located.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for the mark NOVARTIS across multiple jurisdictions, including India. Examples include:

- International Trademark NOVARTIS No. 663765, registered July 1, 1996;
- The International trademark NOVARTIS No. 1349878, registered on November 29, 2016;
- EU Trademark NOVARTIS No. 13393641, registered March 17, 2015;
- US Trademark NOVARTIS No. 2336960, registered April 4, 2000;
- International Trademark NOVARTIS No. 1349878, designating India, registered November 29, 2016;
- International Trademark NOVARTIS No. 1544148, designating India, registered June 29, 2020.

In addition to trademark registrations, the Complainant owns and operates numerous domain names containing the mark NOVARTIS, including <novartis.com> (registered in 1996) and <novartispharma.com>, which it uses to inform the public about its

products and services under the NOVARTIS brand. These domains reflect the Complainant's longstanding and active online presence.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant is a global pharmaceutical and healthcare company headquartered in Switzerland. It was established in 1996 through the merger of Ciba-Geigy and Sandoz. The Complainant develops and delivers innovative medical treatments and has a commercial presence in over 100 countries. In 2024, the Complainant achieved net sales of USD 50.3 billion and reported a net income of USD 11.9 billion. As of December 31, 2024, the Complainant employed approximately 76,000 full-time equivalent employees.

The disputed domain name <novartis-global.com> was registered on September 10, 2025.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

COMPLAINANT:

• The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the protected mark

The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name <novartis-global.com> is confusingly similar to its well-known NOVARTIS trademark.

It submits that the disputed domain name incorporates the trademark NOVARTIS in its entirety, with the addition of the descriptive term "global". According to established UDRP practice, as reflected in section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the domain name, the addition of descriptive or other terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant also notes that the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is a technical requirement of domain name registration and is typically disregarded in the assessment of a confusing similarity.

Accordingly, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name <novartis-global.com> is confusingly similar to the NOVARTIS mark within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy

• The Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name

The Complainant asserts that it has not authorized the Respondent to use the NOVARTIS trademark in any form, including as part of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor does it appear to hold any registered trademarks corresponding to "novartis-global" or similar variations. Public database searches yielded no relevant results. Moreover, the Respondent's registration details appear incomplete and contain placeholder text ("xxxx"), suggesting an attempt to obscure its identity.

The Respondent used a privacy protection service at the time of the disputed domain's registration and has not come forward to claim any legitimate interest in the disputed domain name. A search combining the Respondent's name and the disputed domain name revealed no evidence of association between them.

The disputed domain name structure – combining the Complainant's well-known trademark with the term "global" – suggests an intention to create a misleading association with the Complainant, especially considering the Complainant's global operations. Such a composition may imply affiliation and lead to user confusion, which cannot be considered fair use (WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.5).

The disputed domain name resolved to a sales landing page on "afternic.com" and redirected users to GoDaddy, where the domain name was offered for sale. Moreover, it also resolved to a pay-per-click page featuring sponsored links related to the pharmaceutical sector. UDRP panels have consistently found that registering a domain name incorporating a complainant's trademark for resale, or using it to generate PPC revenue connected to the complainant's area of business, does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

The Complainant also sent a cease-and-desist letter and follow-ups in October 2025, but received no reply.

In light of the above, the Complainant submits that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name under paragraph 4(a)(ii) and 4(c) of the Policy.

• The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith

The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name primarily to obtain financial gain by exploiting the reputation of the Complainant's well-known NOVARTIS trademark. The disputed domain name is currently advertised for sale via

a landing page hosted by Afternic and redirects users to GoDaddy, where it is explicitly offered for purchase. Moreover, it has resolved to a pay-per-click (PPC) page displaying sponsored links related to the pharmaceutical industry—closely aligned with the Complainant's field of activity—thereby generating revenue through the misdirection of Internet users.

According to the Complainant, such conduct—leveraging a third party's trademark for disputed domain name resale or monetization via PPC links—has repeatedly been found to constitute bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

In addition, active MX records are associated with the disputed domain name, which, in the Complainant's view, gives rise to a credible risk of potential phishing or impersonation attacks. Email addresses incorporating the disputed domain name could mislead recipients into believing they originate from the Complainant, exposing users to fraud.

Moreover, the Respondent has a prior adverse UDRP decision issued against them in SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC SE v. Sanjay Nirwan (CAC Case No. CAC-UDRP-107471), indicating a potential pattern of cybersquatting behavior under paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy.

Taken as a whole, these elements support the Complainant's position that the disputed domain name was both registered and is being used in bad faith.

Accordingly, the Complainant submits that the requirements of Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy are fulfilled, and requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

RESPONDENT:

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Respondent to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

The Complaint was filed with the Czech Arbitration Court (the "CAC") on 17 December, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, the CAC attempted to notify the Respondent of the Complaint using all reasonably available means.

The CAC was unable to deliver written notice to the Respondent at the address provided by the Registrar, as it was determined to be invalid. Additionally, email notification sent to postmaster@novartis-global.com was returned due to a permanent delivery failure. Email notification was also sent to snirwan@hotmail.com, but no confirmation of delivery or non-delivery was received.

No alternative contact details were available on the disputed domain name, and the Respondent never accessed the CAC online platform.

As no administratively compliant Response was submitted, the CAC issued a Notification of Respondent Default on 28 January, 2026. In accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the UDRP Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences from the Respondent's default as it considers appropriate.

Therefore, the Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under UDRP were met and there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

The UNIFORM DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE RESOLUTION POLICY (UDRP) of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) (the "Policy") provides that complainant must prove each of the following to obtain transfer or cancellation of the domain name:

1. that respondent's domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which complainant has rights; and

2. that respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name; and

3. the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

1) The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights

The Complainant has provided evidence of numerous trademark registrations for the mark NOVARTIS across multiple jurisdictions, including International, EU, and US trademark registrations, many of which predate the registration of the disputed domain name <novartis-global.com>.

The disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's registered trademark NOVARTIS and merely adds the descriptive term "global" and the generic top-level domain ".com." Under the well-established consensus of UDRP panel decisions, the addition of generic, descriptive, or geographical terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity where the trademark is otherwise recognizable within the domain name (see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.8).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's registered NOVARTIS trademark.

2) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name

The Complainant has made a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Specifically, the Complainant has never authorized the Respondent to use its NOVARTIS trademark, and there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Respondent's name, "Sanjay Nirwan," bears no relation to the disputed domain name, and the registration details appear deliberately obscured, including the use of placeholder text ("xxxx") in the address fields and a privacy shield service at the time of filing. No trademark registrations have been found for "novartis-global" in the name of the Respondent, and independent searches have failed to demonstrate any legitimate commercial or noncommercial activity associated with the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name is offered for sale through Afternic and redirects to GoDaddy, where it is explicitly listed for purchase. Moreover, it has resolved to a pay-per-click (PPC) page featuring sponsored pharmaceutical-related links, targeting the Complainant's sector of activity. Panels have consistently held that such use—particularly when it trades on the goodwill of a well-known trademark—does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial use (see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.9).

The Respondent has not submitted any administratively compliant response and thus failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

3) The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith

The Complainant's trademark NOVARTIS is distinctive and well known globally. The Panel considers it highly unlikely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its rights. The structure of the disputed domain name—combining the Complainant's trademark with the term "global"—further suggests an intention to create an impression of affiliation with the Complainant.

The Complainant has submitted evidence showing that the disputed domain name is actively offered for sale via Afternic and GoDaddy, which strongly indicates an intent to profit from the sale of the disputed domain name incorporating a well-known mark. In addition, the disputed domain name has resolved to a PPC landing page containing links related to the pharmaceutical industry, thereby generating revenue through misdirected user traffic. Such use aligns with a pattern of bad-faith behavior under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy and is consistent with prior panel findings (see e.g., Amazon Technologies, Inc. v. Hei Ze Shang Zi, WIPO Case No. D2019-3208).

Furthermore, the presence of active MX records suggests a capacity to send emails from the disputed domain name, creating a plausible risk of deceptive or fraudulent use, such as impersonation or phishing, which panels have found indicative of bad faith (see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.4).

Finally, the Complainant has submitted evidence that the Respondent was previously found to have engaged in abusive domain name registration practices in another UDRP proceeding (see CAC-UDRP-107471). This supports a finding of a pattern of cybersquatting behavior under paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy.

For all the reasons stated above, the Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has proven the third element of the Policy—namely, that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name were in bad faith.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

AND THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME(S) IS (ARE) TO BE

1. **novartis-global.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Barbora Donathová**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-02-05

Publish the Decision