Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108929

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108929
Time of filing	2026-08-20 08:50:52
Domain names	novartispi.com

Case administrator

Organization	Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	Novartis AG

Complainant representative

Organization	Abion GmbH

Respondent

Organization	gao xian yang

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.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Novartis Group is one of the biggest global pharmaceutical and healthcare groups. The disputed domain name was registered June 3, 2026 and resolves to a website related to gambling.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it.

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).

The Complainant owns numerous trademarks NOVARTIS registered in numerous jurisdictions all over the world, which were registered many years before creation of the disputed domain name on June 3, 2026, such as but not limited to the following registrations in China where Respondent purports to reside:

- The China trademark NOVARTIS No. 15569053, registered on December 14, 2015, in class 9;

- The China trademark NOVARTIS No. 42520143, registered on September 7, 2020, in class 35;

- The China trademark NOVARTIS No. 42520145, registered on September 7, 2020, in class 5; and

- The China trademark NOVARTIS No. 78789569, registered on November 28, 2024, in class 5.

The addition of the two letters "pi" to the famous NOVARTIS trademark does nothing to alleviate the obvious confusing similarity of the disputed domain name.

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).

The Complainant states that it has never granted the Respondent any rights to use the NOVARTIS trademark in any form, including in the disputed domain name. Moreover, there is no evidence that the Respondent is known by the disputed domain name or owns any corresponding registered trademarks.

There is no evidence that Respondent has been using, or preparing to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services, no making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. To the contrary, the structure of the disputed domain name, incorporating the Complainant’s trademark NOVARTIS in its entirety plus the term “PI”, reveals that the Respondent’s intention in registering the disputed domain name was to refer to the Complainant, its trademark and business activity and to create an association, and a subsequent likelihood of confusion, with the Complainant and its NOVARTIS trademark in Internet users’ minds.

The disputed domain name resolves to an active website promoting gambling activities. There is no evidence showing that the Respondent has been using, or preparing to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services or has made a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. On the contrary, the Respondent has been using the disputed domain name to capitalize on the Complainant’s NOVARTIS trademark and thus attract Internet users to its website – displaying gambling related content – to obtain commercial gain.

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).

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name many years after the registrations of the Complainant’s NOVARTIS trademarks. The NOVARTIS trademark is a well-known trademark registered in many countries, including China where Respondent purports to reside. It is implausible that the Respondent did not know about the Complainant and its NOVARTIS trademark when it registered the disputed domain name. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith seeking to take advantage of Complainant's mark.

The website associated to the disputed domain name is related to gambling. As explained above, by registering the disputed domain name – as the structure prominently reflects the Complainant’s trademark NOVARTIS – the Respondent has capitalized on the Complainant’s trademark for the purpose of diverting Internet users to its website. Moreover, the Respondent presumably obtains financial gain from the gambling services advertised on the website. It therefore appears that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s NOVARTIS trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent’s website.

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

Respondent has capitalized on the Complainant’s trademark for the purpose of diverting Internet users to its gambling website.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

1. **novartispi.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Mike Rodenbaugh**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-09-18

Publish the Decision