# Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-108994

| | |
|---|---|
| Case number | CAC-UDRP-108994 |
| Time of filing | 2026-09-18 10:24:37 |
| Domain names | novartiiscareer.online, novartiiscareer.com |

## Case administrator

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

## Complainant

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

## Complainant representative

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

## Respondent

| | |
|---|---|
| Name | Daniel Villan |

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 names.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant is the owner of several trademarks including the word NOVARTIS, such as:

- the international word trademark NOVARTIS registered on 1 July 1996 under No. 663765 for goods and services of the classes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 20, 22, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 40, 42;
- the European word trademark NOVARTIS registered on 17 March 2015 under No. 13393641 for goods and services of the classes 9 and 10; and
- the United States word trademark NOVARTIS registered on 4 April 2000 under No. 2336960 for goods and services of the classes 1, 5, 9, 10, 29, 30, 31, 32, 42.

The Complainant is also the owner of numerous domain names comprising the mark NOVARTIS, including <novartis.com>, <novartis.ch>, and <novartispharma.com>.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Novartis Group is one of the biggest global pharmaceutical and healthcare groups. Novartis AG, with headquarters in Switzerland, was created in 1996 through a merger of Ciba-Geigy and Sandoz and is the holding company of the Novartis Group. The

Group provides solutions addressing the evolving needs of patients worldwide by developing and delivering innovative medical treatments and drugs. In 2025, Novartis achieved net sales of USD 54.5 billion, total net income of USD 14 billion, and employed 75,267 full-time equivalent employees as of 31 December 2025. The Group also offers a wide range of career and training opportunities and maintains a substantial online presence.

The disputed domain names information is the following:

- <novartiiscareer.online > was registered on 29 August 2026 and
- <novartiiscareer.com> was registered on 26 August 2026 .

At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain names did not resolve to an active website and have been passively held.

## PARTIES CONTENTIONS

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

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

It ought to be indicated that the Centre sent of the complaint but nor the advice of delivery thereof was returned to the Czech Arbitration Court. The notice of the Commencement of the administrative proceeding was therefore only sent by e-mail. Yet, the e-mail notice sent to postmaster@novartiiscareer.online and to postmaster@novartiiscareer.com were returned back undelivered as the e-mail addresses had permanent fatal errors. The e-mail notices were also sent to ubandawakibawa@gmail.com, but the Czech Arbitration Court never received any proof of delivery or notification of undelivery. No further e-mail addresses could be found on the disputed sites.

The Respondent never accessed the online platform.

## RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain names are 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 names (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 names have been registered and are 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

Notwithstanding the fact that no Response has been filed, the Panel shall consider the issues present in the case based on the statements and documents submitted by the Complainant.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following elements:

- that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant

has rights; and
- that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

**Identical or confusingly similar**

The Complainant has provided evidence and has thus established its rights in the NOVARTIS trademark.

The disputed domain names <novartiiscareer.online > and <novartiiscareer.com> are found to be confusingly similar to the Complainant's Trademark. This finding is based on the settled practice in evaluating the existence of a likelihood of confusion of:

- disregarding the top-level suffix in the domain names (i.e. ".online" or ".com");

The Panel notes that a common practice has emerged under the Policy to disregard in appropriate circumstances the general Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") section of domain names for the purposes of the comparison under the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i). The Panel sees no reason not to follow the same approach here, so it will disregard the ".com" gTLD or ".online" section of the disputed domain names.

- finding that the identical reproduction of the trademark right or same with the adding of a letter "i", and a generic word i.e. "CAREER" would not be considered sufficient to distinguish the domain names from the concerned trademark being reproduced strictly identically which is intentionally designed to be confusingly similar with the trademark, i.e. a case of typosquatting.

The disputed domain names are therefore confusingly similar to the earlier right "GEEK BAR", and the Panel concludes that the Complainant has satisfied the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

**No Rights or Legitimate Interests**

The Complainant's assertions that the Respondent is not commonly known by either disputed domain names and are not affiliated with or authorised by the Complainant are sufficient to constitute a prima facie showing of absence of rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain names on the part of the Respondent.

Therefore, in the absence of the Respondents' response, the Panel concludes that there is no indication that the disputed domain names were intended to be used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services as required by Policy.

Consequently, the evidentiary burden shifts to the Respondents to show by concrete evidence that they do have rights or legitimate interests in those respective disputed domain names. However, the Respondents failed to provide any information and evidence that they have relevant rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of Policy).

**Bad Faith**

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

The Complainant submits that the NOVARTIS trademark is well known internationally and has been extensively used in connection with its pharmaceutical and healthcare business for many years. The Complainant contends that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its NOVARTIS trademark when registering the disputed domain names.

The Panel finds that the Respondent was more likely than not aware of the Complainant and its NOVARTIS trademark when registering the disputed domain names. The NOVARTIS trademark is highly distinctive, well known internationally, and long predates the registration of the disputed domain names. The disputed domain names incorporate the NOVARTIS trademark in its entirety together with the term "career", which directly relates to the Complainant's recruitment and career activities. The Panel therefore considers that the disputed domain names were intentionally chosen to target the Complainant and create an impression of association with the Complainant.

Although the disputed domain names do not resolve to an active website, passive holding does not prevent a finding of bad faith. In the present case, the Panel notes the reputation of the NOVARTIS trademark, the absence of any Response or evidence of good-faith use, the composition of the disputed domain names suggesting an affiliation with the Complainant, and the existence of active MX records associated with the disputed domain names. Taken together, these circumstances support a finding that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

For the foregoing reasons, the Panel finds the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

## Accepted

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

1. **novartiiscareer.online**: Transferred
2. **novartiiscareer.com**: Transferred

## PANELLISTS

| | |
|---|---|
| Name | **David-Irving Tayer** |

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2026-11-02

Publish the Decision