Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108616

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108616
Time of filing	2026-05-05 08:46:15
Domain names	novartisbreakthrough.com

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Novartis AG

Complainant representative

Organization	Abion GmbH

Respondent

Organization	Waveplay Interactive Inc.

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.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant owns numerous trademarks NOVARTIS registered in many jurisdictions worldwide, including:

- International trademark NOVARTIS with registration number 663765, registered on July 1, 1996, for goods and services in classes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 20, 22, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 40, 42;
- International trademark NOVARTIS with registration number 1349878, registered on November 29, 2016, for goods and services in classes 9, 10, 41, 42, 44 and 45, designating The Philippines; and
- Philippines trademark NOVARTIS with registration number PHM000001349878, registered on August 3, 2017, for goods and services in classes 9, 10, 41, 42, 44 and 45.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Novartis Group is one of the biggest global pharmaceutical and healthcare groups. It provides solutions to address the evolving needs of patients worldwide by developing and delivering innovative medical treatments and drugs. The Complainant was created in 1996 through a merger of two other companies Ciba-Geigy and Sandoz, and is the holding company of the Novartis Group. In 2025, the Novartis Group achieved net sales of USD 54.5 billion, and total net income amounted to USD 14 billion and employed 75267 full-time equivalent employees as of December 31, 2025.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 27, 2025 and resolved to a website which displayed the Complainant's NOVARTIS trademark and the term "BREAKTHROUGH", and provided an online form asking visitors to "declare your bold vow to turn commitment into action, inspire those who believe in you, and make a lasting impact". To that extent, Internet users were asked to provide their name and a message.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent did not file an administratively compliant Response. However, on June 11, 2026, the Respondent sent an e-mail to the Center claiming that it has "no intention to keep this domain name and Novartis AG may request [the Respondent's registrar, Panelist] to close the domain or transfer the ownership to [the Complainant, Panelist]".

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 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

Consent to Transfer

As stated above, under Parties' Contentions, the Respondent confirmed its unconditional consent to transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant. According to WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.10, panels may accept such consent as the basis for a transfer order without the need to consider the UDRP grounds.

In this case, the Center received a message from the Respondent in which it unconditionally agreed to transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant. The record shows nothing indicating that the Respondent attached certain conditions to its consent, which is after all "unconditional", and/or that it withdrew its consent. The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent's communication clearly demonstrates the Respondent's unconditional consent to the transfer of the disputed domain name. The Panel does not consider it necessary to ask the Complainant, by Procedural Order, whether it agrees to a simple order of the transfer of the disputed domain name, because the record shows that the Complainant requests a transfer of the disputed domain name, the Respondent has not actively objected to such simple order, and there is no other reason why it would be appropriate to proceed instead to a substantive decision on the merits (e.g., Build-A-Bear Workshop, Inc. v. Daniel Keelagher, WIPO Case No. D2025-2769).

The Panel therefore orders the immediate transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **novartisbreakthrough.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Alfred Meijboom**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-06-11

Publish the Decision