

Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108913

Case number	CAC-UDRP-108913
-------------	-----------------

Time of filing	2026-08-09 21:41:08
----------------	---------------------

Domain names	novartisplarmlab.com
--------------	----------------------

Case administrator

Name	Olga Slanařová (Case admin)
------	-----------------------------

Complainant

Organization	Novartis AG
--------------	-------------

Complainant representative

Organization	Abion GmbH
--------------	------------

Respondent

Organization	PropertyManagement Services 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 is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for NOVARTIS, including, inter alia:

- International Trademark NOVARTIS No. 663765, registered on July 1, 1996;
- European Union Trademark NOVARTIS No. 013393641, registered on March 17, 2015; and
- United States Trademark NOVARTIS No. 4986124, registered on June 28, 2016 ("NOVARTIS Trademarks").

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, Novartis AG, is a Swiss pharmaceutical company and the holding company of the Novartis Group.

The Complainant owns, inter alia, the domain names <novartis.com> and <novartispharma.com>.

The disputed domain name <novartisplarmlab.com> was registered on April 10, 2026.

The evidence shows that the disputed domain name has resolved to a website presenting itself as "Novartis Pharmaceuticals and Laboratories" and promoting pharmaceutical products, anti-viral drugs, vaccines and pharmaceutical research. The website prominently uses the NOVARTIS name.

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).

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

RIGHTS

The Complainant has established rights in the NOVARTIS Trademarks.

The disputed domain name incorporates the NOVARTIS Trademarks in their entirety and adds the terms "plarm" and "lab". The NOVARTIS trademark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. The term "plarm" appears to be a misspelling of "pharm", a commonly used abbreviation referring to the pharmaceutical field, while "lab" is commonly understood as an abbreviation of "laboratory".

The addition of these terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element of the Policy (see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8). The ".com" gTLD is disregarded for the purposes of this assessment.

Accordingly, the first element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

A complainant is required to establish a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. Once such a case is made, the burden of production shifts to the respondent to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name (see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.1). Failure to do so results in the complainant satisfying paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy (as per Article 2.1 of WIPO Jurisprudential Overview 3.1 and WIPO Case No. D2003-0455, Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.).

The record contains no indication that the Complainant has authorized the Respondent to use the NOVARTIS trademark and there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Moreover, the disputed domain name has been used for a website presenting itself as "Novartis Pharmaceuticals and Laboratories" and promoting pharmaceutical products and research. Such use creates a misleading impression that the website is operated by, affiliated with, or authorized by the Complainant.

Use of a domain name for impersonation or passing off cannot confer rights or legitimate interests upon a respondent (see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1).

Based on the contentions of the Complainant, the Panel therefore finds that the Complainant has successfully established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests. As the Respondent has failed to provide any relevant evidence demonstrating any such rights or legitimate interests, the Complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element.

BAD FAITH

The NOVARTIS trademark had been registered and used for many years before the registration of the disputed domain name. Previous UDRP panels have also recognized the reputation of the NOVARTIS trademark. The disputed domain name was registered only in April 2026.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name combines the NOVARTIS trademark with the terms "plarm" and "lab", which allude to the pharmaceutical and laboratory field in which the Complainant operates.

Most importantly, the website associated with the disputed domain name presents itself as "Novartis Pharmaceuticals and Laboratories" and promotes pharmaceutical products and research. Taken together, these factors demonstrate that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and deliberately targeted its NOVARTIS trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

As regards use in bad faith, the Respondent has used the disputed domain name for a website which impersonates the Complainant and creates a false impression of authorization by, or affiliation with, the Complainant. The Panel finds that such use is intended to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the NOVARTIS trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website and constitutes evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel notes that the evidence also shows that an MX record was configured for the disputed domain name.

Taking all circumstances into account, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Accordingly, the third element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy is satisfied.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

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

- 1. novartisplarmlab.com: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	Karel Šindelka
------	----------------

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-09-23

Publish the Decision