

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Moelis & Company v. George Moisidis

Case No. D2025-0207

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Moelis & Company, United States of America (United States), represented by Soteria LLC., United States.

The Respondent is George Moisidis, Greece.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <moelis.art> is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on January 18, 2025. On January 20, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 21, 2025, 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 January 21, 2025, 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 January 22, 2025.

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 January 27, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 21, 2025. The Respondent sent an informal email communication on February 16, 2025. Attached to the email was a settlement form, signed by the Respondent. The Respondent did not submit any further response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties of the Commencement of Panel Appointment Process on February 28, 2025.

The Center appointed Warwick A. Rothnie as the sole panelist in this matter on March 6, 2025. 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**

The Complainant is an investment bank headquartered in New York in the United States. It provides financial advisory services to corporations, governments, and financial sponsors.

Amongst other things, the Complainant promotes its services from a website at “www.moelis.com”. From this website, the Panel has ascertained that the Complainant has eight offices across the United States as well as offices in Amsterdam, Frankfurt, London, Paris, Dubai, Riyadh, Tel Aviv, Beijing, Hong Kong, China Mumbai, and Brazil. The Complainant also has operations through strategic partners in Australia and Mexico.

The Complainant owns United States Registered Trademark No 4,904,062, MOELIS & COMPANY, which has been registered in the Principal Register since February 23, 2016, in respect of a range of financial advisory services in International Classes 35 and 36.

According to the Whois Report, the disputed domain name was registered on November 2, 2024.

It does not appear to have resolved to an active website and, at the time this decision is being prepared, resolves to a webpage stating, “Domain withdrawn”.

#### **5. Discussion and Findings**

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that in order to divest the Respondent of a disputed domain name, the Complainant must demonstrate each of the following:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of 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 directs the Panel to decide the 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.

The Respondent submitted an informal communication offering to settle the dispute and transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant. Attached to the email was a Standard Settlement Form signed by the Respondent but not by the Complainant. The Standard Form Settlement template states on its face:

“Please note that the Standard Settlement Form is not intended to be an agreement itself, but only to summarize the essential terms of the Parties’ separate settlement agreement for purposes of Registrar action.”

In any event, in the present case the Complainant had not signed the form submitted by the Respondent. Further, the Complainant has not responded to the Center’s requests whether it wished to pursue the apparent settlement proposal made by the Respondent and there is nothing in the record confirming the Parties have reached a separate settlement agreement, but nor has the Respondent withdrawn its request to transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant.

In these circumstances, the Panel will proceed to a limited analysis of the case only to ensure there is an appropriate basis for use of the procedures under the Policy. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("WIPO Overview 3.0"), section 4.10.

The Complainant has proven ownership of the registered trademark for MOELIS & COMPANY.

Disregarding the ".art" generic Top Level Domain (WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.11), therefore, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark as "Moelis" is the essential or distinctive feature of the trademark and, as the Complainant notes, it is a common colloquial or informal practice to refer to companies without reference to expressions such as "& COMPANY". See e.g. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.7.

In light of this and the Respondent's expressed desire to transfer the disputed domain name to the Complainant, the Panel considers it appropriate to order transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant 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 <moelis.art> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Warwick A Rothnie/*

**Warwick A Rothnie**

Sole Panelist

Date: March 20, 2025