

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Jones Lang LaSalle IP, Inc. v. Goat / Goat
Case No. D2023-3148

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Jones Lang LaSalle IP, Inc., United States of America, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Goat / Goat, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The Disputed Domain Name <jonelanglasalle.com> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 21, 2023. On July 21, 2023, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name(s). On July 22, 2023, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 26, 2023. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 15, 2023. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 16, 2023.

The Center appointed Colin T. O’Brien as the sole panelist in this matter on August 22, 2023. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

Complainant is a professional services and investment management firm specializing in real estate. Its regional headquarters for the Americas, EMEA and Asia Pacific businesses are located in Chicago, London and Singapore, respectively. Complainant was formed by the merger of Jones Lang Wootton and LaSalle Partners in 1999. Since 2014, Complainant is an industry leader in property and corporate facility management services, with a portfolio of 5 billion square feet worldwide. With a workforce of approximately 91,000 Complainant serves clients in over 80 countries from more than 300 corporate office locations worldwide. In 2020, Complainant reported a revenue of USD 6.1billion.

Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registrations:

- JONES LANG LASALLE and Design, U.S. Reg. Number 3083128, registered on April 18, 2006 in Classes 36 & 37;
- JONES LANG LASALLE Canadian Reg. No. TMA657256, registered on January, 24, 2006 in Classes 36 & 37;
- JONES LANG LASALLE EU Reg. No. 1126291, registered on June 13, 2006 in Classes 36, 37, & 42;
- JONES LANG LASALLE UK Reg. No. 00901126291, registered on June 13, 2006 in Classes 36, 37, & 42;
- JONES LANG LASALLE Singapore Reg. No. T9906699B, registered on February 2, 1999 in Class 36;
- JONES LANG LASALLE China Reg. No. 1475951, registered on November 14, 2000 in Class 36; and
- JONES LANG LASALLE Australia Reg. No. 798445, registered on June 26, 1999 in Classes 36 and 37.

Complainant owns and operates a website at <joneslanglasalle.com> which received 86.91K visitors during the period of February 2021 to July 2021. Complainant's Twitter page has over 75,100 followers; its Facebook page has over 131,000 "likes" and its LinkedIn page has over 729,000 followers.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on March 1, 2023, and it does not currently resolve to any active website.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Disputed Domain Name is a purposeful misspelling of Complainant's JONES LANG LASALLE trademark and must be considered confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. More specifically: the Disputed Domain Name varies from Complainant's trademark by just one letter – Respondent has removed the letter "s" in JONES.

Respondent's domain must be considered a prototypical example of typo squatting.

Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with Complainant in any way. Complainant has not given Respondent permission to use Complainant's trademarks in any manner, including in domain names. Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, which evinces a lack of rights or legitimate interest.

The pertinent Whois information identifies the Registrant as "Goat / Goat", which does not resemble the Disputed Domain Name in any manner. Thus, where no evidence, including the Whois record for the Disputed Domain Name, suggests that Respondent is commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name.

Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name to redirect Internet users to a website that resolves to an error page and lacks content. Respondent has failed to make use of this Disputed Domain Name's website and has not demonstrated any attempt to make legitimate use of the Disputed Domain Name and website, which evinces a lack of rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

By registering a domain name that is a slightly misspelled version of Complainant's JONES LANG LASALLE trademark, Respondent has created a domain name that is confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark, and almost identical to its primary domain name. As such, Respondent has demonstrated a knowledge of and familiarity with Complainant's brand and business. The composition of the Disputed Domain Name makes it illogical to believe that Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name without specifically targeting the Complainant.

At the time of registration of the Disputed Domain Name, the Respondent knew, or at least should have known, of the existence of the Complainant's trademarks and that registration of domain names containing well-known trademarks constitutes bad faith *per se*.

The Disputed Domain Name can only be taken as intending to cause confusion among Internet users as to the source of the Disputed Domain Name, and thus, the Disputed Domain Name must be considered as having been registered and used in bad faith pursuant to Policy paragraph 4(b)(iv), with no good faith use possible. More specifically, where the Disputed Domain Name is visually almost identical to Complainant's trademark and primary domain name, there is no plausible good-faith reason or logic for Respondent to have registered the Disputed Domain Name. Rather, it is indicative of an intention to hold the Disputed Domain Name for some future active use in a way which would be competitive with or otherwise detrimental to Complainant".

The Disputed Domain Name has also been set up with mail exchanger (MX) records. This shows that the Disputed Domain Name may be actively used for email purposes. Emails emanating from the Disputed Domain Name could not reasonably be used for any good faith purpose given the fact the Disputed Domain Name is directly identical to the Complainant's trademark. Instead, it is likely that the Disputed Domain Name may be actively used to facilitate fraudulent activity such as phishing, impersonating or passing off as the Complainant.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Complainant has demonstrated it owns long-standing registered and common law trademark rights in the JONES LANG LASALLE mark. The Disputed Domain Name incorporates a misspelling of the JONES LANG LASALLE mark, namely with the removal of the letter "S" from JONES which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the mark and the Disputed Domain Name. See sections 1.7 and 1.9 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)").

Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the mark in which Complainant has rights.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant has presented a *prima facie* case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name and has not been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. The fact that the Respondent obtained the Disputed Domain Name years after the Complainant had begun using its JONES LANG LASALLE mark indicates that the Respondent sought to piggyback on the mark for illegitimate reasons.

After a complainant has made a *prima facie* case, the burden of production shifts to a respondent to present evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. See, e.g., *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0455](#).

The Respondent has provided no evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. Moreover, the Disputed Domain Name is virtually identical to the Complainant's trademark other than the lack of the letter "S" in Jones which implies an association with Complainant. Such a risk of affiliation or association with the Complainant and its mark cannot constitute fair use.

In the absence of any evidence rebutting the Complainant's *prima facie* case indicating the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Disputed Domain Name was registered many years after Complainant first registered and used its JONES LANG LASALLE mark. Considering the evidence on the record provided by Complainant with respect to the extent of use of its JONES LANG LASALLE mark, the typo squatting of Complainant's mark in the Disputed Domain Name, combined with the absence of any evidence provided by Respondent to the contrary, it is sufficient to satisfy the Panel that, at the time the Disputed Domain Name was registered, Respondent undoubtedly knew of Complainant's JONES LANG LASALLE mark, and knew that it had no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. Prior UDRP panels have held that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. See section 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

There is no benign reason for Respondent to have registered the Disputed Domain Name.

Moreover, UDRP panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. See section 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

The Panel finds that the only plausible basis for registering and passively holding the Disputed Domain Name is for illegitimate and bad faith purposes. In view of section 3.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), given the above considerations, the totality of the circumstances support a finding of bad faith, regardless of the current inactive state of the Disputed Domain Name.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the Disputed Domain Name <jonelanglasalle.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Colin T. O'Brien/
Colin T. O'Brien
Sole Panelist
Date: September 5, 2023