

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Jones Lang LaSalle IP, Inc. v. zeek lound
Case No. D2024-2564

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is zeek lound, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <jonaslanguilasalle.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 24, 2024. On June 25, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 25, 2024, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 27, 2024, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 1, 2024.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended 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 5, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 25, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 29, 2024.

The Center appointed Lynda J. Zadra-Symes as the sole panelist in this matter on August 12, 2024. 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 wholly-owned subsidiary of Jones Lang LaSalle Incorporated which, together with all of its consolidated subsidiaries, comprises the JLL group. The JLL group is headquartered in Chicago, IL, USA and is a professional services and investment management firm specializing in real estate. The JLL group was formed by the merger of Jones Lang Wootton and LaSalle Partners in 1999 in what was the largest international merger in the real estate industry at the time. With a workforce of approximately 91,000, the JLL group serves clients in over 80 countries from more than 300 corporate office locations worldwide. In 2020, the JLL group reported a revenue of USD 6.1 billion.

In 2015, JLL achieved Fortune 500 status and is recognized by Fortune Magazine as one of the “World’s Most Admired Companies” in 2021 for the sixth consecutive year. Additionally, JLL was recognized as the “World’s Most Ethical Companies” by the Ethisphere Institute, for the 14th consecutive year (2021).

Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for the mark JONES LANG LASALLE, including the following:

Registration No.

001126291	European Union Intellectual Property Office (“EUIPO”), Registered June 13, 2000
001126382	EUIPO, Registered June 13, 2000
011014065	EUIPO, Registered December 4, 2012
UK00901126291	United Kingdom, Registered June 13, 2000
TMA657256	Canada, Registered January 24, 2006
3083128	United States, April 18, 2006

The JLL group owns the domain names <jll.com> and <joneslanglasalle.com>, among others and also owns the rights to use the <.jll> and <.lasalle> Top-Level Domains. In May 2024, Complainant’s websites at its primary domain names <jll.com> and <joneslanglasalle.com> received 909.4K and 3.61K visitors respectively.

The JLL group also has a social media presence through the use of its Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn pages. Its Twitter page has over 83,000 followers, its Facebook page has over 134,000 “likes”, and its LinkedIn page has over two million followers.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 1, 2024. Respondent was using the disputed domain name to redirect internet users to a website featuring links to third-party websites, including links for “Business Spaces for Rent” and “Tax Lien Investing”. The disputed domain name currently resolves to an inactive site. The disputed domain name has also been setup with mail exchanger (MX) records.

Respondent did not respond to Complainant’s cease and desist letters.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

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

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is an example of “typosquatting” and is confusingly similar to Complainant’s trademark, that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In order to succeed in its claim, Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs the Panel to decide a complaint “on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable”.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant’s trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name differs from Complainant’s trademark by just one letter and is an example of typosquatting. The Panel finds Complainant’s mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant’s mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of “proving a negative”, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Respondent is not sponsored 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. The information disclosed by the Registrar identifies the registrant as "zeek lound" which does not resemble the disputed domain name in any manner. Previously, Respondent was using the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to a website featuring links to third-party websites, some of which directly compete with Complainant's business. For example, the website featured multiple third-party links for "Business Spaces for Rent" and "Tax Lien Investing". Presumably, Respondent receives pay per click fees from the linked websites that are listed at the disputed domain name's website. This is not a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Currently, the disputed domain name redirects to a website that resolves to a blank page, which clearly does not represent any bona fide offering.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel notes that Complainant's mark is known internationally, with trademark registrations across numerous countries. By registering a domain name that is a slightly misspelled version of Complainant's mark, Respondent has demonstrated a knowledge of and familiarity with Complainant's brand and business. The record indicates that Respondent was most likely aware of Complainant's brands at the time of registering the disputed domain name. At the time of registration, Respondent knew or should have known of the existence of Complainant's trademarks. Respondent is attempting to capitalize on typing errors committed by Complainant's customers when trying to locate Complainant on the Internet. The disputed domain name is designed to closely mimic Complainant's trademark and primary domain. Typosquatting itself has been taken as evidence of bad faith registration and use by past panels. The record indicates that Respondent is intentionally attempting to attract for commercial gain Internet users to Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of Respondent's web site.

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. Such emails could not reasonably be used for any good faith purpose given the fact that the disputed domain name is a slight misspelling of 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.

At the time of the initial filing of the Complaint, Respondent had employed a privacy service to hide its identity, which past panels have held may serve as further evidence of bad faith registration and use under the totality of circumstances. Respondent also ignored Complainant's cease and desist letters.

The Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under 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 <jonaslanguilasalle.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Lynda J. Zadra-Symes/

Lynda J. Zadra-Symes

Sole Panelist

Date: August 26, 2024