

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Cantor Fitzgerald Securities v. AAAA AAAA
Case No. D2025-1836

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Cantor Fitzgerald Securities, United States of America, represented by Akerman LLP, United States of America.

The Respondent is AAAA AAAA, United States of America.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <cantorukfx.com> and <cantor-us.com> (the “Disputed Domain Names”) are registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 7, 2025. On May 8, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 9, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Disputed Domain Names 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 May 9, 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 May 10, 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 May 12, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 1, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 2, 2025.

The Center appointed Douglas M. Isenberg as the sole panelist in this matter on June 10, 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

Complainant states that it was “[f]ormed over 75 years ago”; that it “has become widely recognized as an international leader in global financial services, including, without limitation, broker-dealer, domestic and international equities, fixed income and currencies, real estate, and investment banking services”; that it “is hailed as a premier dealer of U.S. government agency and U.S. treasury securities, in addition to credit securities, asset-backed and mortgage-backed securities, and emerging market credit securities”; and that it “has over 1800 employees serving more than 5000 institutional clients in 35 locations around the globe.”

Complainant further states, and provides documentation in support thereof, that it is the owner of “many valid and subsisting U.S. trademark registrations” for consist of or contain CANTOR and CANTOR FITZGERALD, including the following (the “CANTOR Trademarks”):

- U.S. Reg. No. 2,682,690 for CANTOR (registered February 4, 2003) for use in connection with, inter alia, “financial services”.
- U.S. Reg. No. 4,930,552 for CANTOR (registered April 5, 2016) for use in connection with, inter alia, “real estate acquisition services”.
- U.S. Reg. No. 3,170,687 for CANTOR (stylized) (registered November 14, 2006) for use in connection with, inter alia, “financial services”.
- U.S. Reg. No. 2,682,691 for CANTOR FITZGERALD (registered on February 4, 2003) for use in connection with, inter alia, “financial services”.

Complainant further states that it “owns and has used the domain name CANTOR.COM since at least as early as 1998 in connection with a website regarding Complainant’s financial services.”

The Disputed Domain Names were created on May 1, 2025 – which Complainant says was “after Complainant filed a UDRP proceeding concerning the domain name CANTORFX.CC... and after Respondent defaulted in that proceeding.”¹

Complainant states, and provides documentation in support thereof, that Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Names in connection with “an alleged trading platform for various national currencies, such as U.S. dollars and Euros, and cryptocurrencies such as Bitcoin, and Ethereum”; and that “Respondent offers unsuspecting customers the ability to open accounts for currency and cryptocurrency trading” but “the customer is not able to retrieve any of the funds placed in the account with Respondent’s platform at the Domain Name[s].” In support thereof, Complainant provides screenshots of web pages allowing Internet users to register for an account, and an email apparently sent by a victim of the website using the Disputed Domain Name <cantor-us.com>.

¹ Although the dispute concerning <cantorfx.cc> was pending when the Complaint in the instant proceeding was filed, a panel subsequently issued a decision ordering transfer of the domain name <cantorfx.cc>. *Cantor Fitzgerald Securities v. chsptmonar chsptmonar*, WIPO Case No. [DCC2025-0007](#). Complainant states that the registrant of <cantorfx.cc> was engaged in “the same usage” as in the instant proceeding.

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 Names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that

- The Disputed Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to the CANTOR Trademarks because, inter alia, each of the Disputed Domain Names "consist[s] of an exact copy of" the CANTOR Trademarks; "[t]he addition of the abbreviations US and UK (which stands for the United States and United Kingdom) at the tail of the Domain Names does not dispel the likelihood of confusion" because "[s]uch combination suggests that the Domain Names are for a web site connected to Complainant in the United States or the United Kingdom"; and "the addition of the abbreviation 'fx' (commonly used for foreign exchange) at the tail of the CANTORUKFX.COM domain name does not distinguish the Domain Name" from the CANTOR Trademarks.

- Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names because, inter alia, "[w]here, ... as here, Complainant's mark is fully incorporated into and emphasized in Respondent's domain names there can be no rights or legitimate use by Respondent"; "[t]he information for Respondent appears to be bogus, particularly as Respondent is attempting to impersonate Complainant by using the name 'Cantor Fitzgerald Group Ltd.' on Respondent's website at the Domain Names"; "[t]here is no relationship between Complainant and Respondent giving rise to any license, permission, or other right by which Respondent could own or use any domain name incorporating" the CANTOR Trademarks; "Respondent has used the Domain Names to attract consumers to a website holding itself out as related to Complainant in furtherance of a fraudulent scheme for the profit of Respondent"; and "[i]n view of Complainant's extensive use of the CANTOR and CANTOR FITZGERALD marks, and the fact that Respondent has no rights in Complainant's CANTOR and CANTOR FITZGERALD marks and has used the Domain Names for a fraudulent scheme for Respondent's profit, Respondent does not, and cannot, have a legitimate noncommercial or fair use purpose for registering and using the Domain Names and has not done so for a 'bona fide' offering of goods and services."

- The Disputed Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith because, inter alia, "the Domain Names completely incorporates and emphasizes Complainant's exact CANTOR mark, and was registered long after Complainant's rights in its CANTOR Marks were established, after Complainant registered the CANTOR Marks, and after Complainant's financial services became well-known"; Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Names to engage in "a fraudulent scheme without authorization for purposes of promoting an alleged online financial currency and cryptocurrency trading service"; Respondent has "used Complainant's Cantor Fitzgerald name on its website, all in furtherance of a fraud"; and "Respondent registered and started using the Domain Names after Complainant filed a UDRP concerning its use of the domain name CANTORFX.CC."

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Based upon the trademark registrations cited by Complainant, it is apparent that Complainant has rights in and to the CANTOR Trademarks.

As to whether the Disputed Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to the CANTOR Trademarks, the relevant comparison to be made is with the second-level portion of the Disputed Domain Names only (i.e., “cantorukfx” and “cantor-us”) because “[t]he applicable Top-Level Domain (‘TLD’) in a domain name (e.g., ‘.com’, ‘.club’, ‘.nyc’) is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test”. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 1.11.1.

As set forth in section 1.7 of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#): “in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark for purposes of UDRP standing.” Further, as set forth in section 1.8 of [WIPO Overview 3.0](#): “Where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element.” Here, the geographic terms “us” and “uk” and the term “fx” do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Further, inclusion of a hyphen in one of the Disputed Domain Names is irrelevant because “the insertion of a hyphen... [is] not [a] relevantly distinguishing feature.” *Western Union Holdings, Inc. v. Anna Valdieri*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0884](#).

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Complainant has argued that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Names because, inter alia, “[w]here, ... as here, Complainant’s mark is fully incorporated into and emphasized in Respondent’s domain names there can be no rights or legitimate use by Respondent”; “[t]he information for Respondent appears to be bogus, particularly as Respondent is attempting to impersonate Complainant by using the name ‘Cantor Fitzgerald Group Ltd.’ on Respondent’s website at the Domain Names”; “[t]here is no relationship between Complainant and Respondent giving rise to any license, permission, or other right by which Respondent could own or use any domain name incorporating” the CANTOR Trademarks; “Respondent has used the Domain Names to attract consumers to a website holding itself out as related to Complainant in furtherance of a fraudulent scheme for the profit of Respondent”; and “[i]n view of Complainant’s extensive use of the CANTOR and CANTOR FITZGERALD marks, and the fact that Respondent has no rights in Complainant’s CANTOR and CANTOR FITZGERALD marks and has used the Domain Names for a fraudulent scheme for Respondent’s profit, Respondent does not, and cannot, have a legitimate noncommercial or fair use purpose for registering and using the Domain Names and has not done so for a ‘bona fide’ offering of goods and services.”

[WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1, states: “[w]hile 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 often impossible 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element.”

The Panel finds that Complainant has established its prima facie case and without any evidence from Respondent to the contrary, the Panel is satisfied that Complainant has satisfied the second element of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Whether a domain name is registered and used in bad faith for purposes of the Policy may be determined by evaluating four (non-exhaustive) factors set forth in the Policy: (i) circumstances indicating that the registrant has registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise

transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the registrant's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or (ii) the registrant has registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the registrant has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or (iii) the registrant has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or (iv) by using the domain name, the registrant has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the registrant's website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the registrant's website or location or of a product or service on the registrant's website or location. Policy, paragraph 4(b).

The Panel here agrees with the conclusions of the panel in *Cantor Fitzgerald Securities v. chsptmonar chsptmonar*, WIPO Case No. [DCC2025-0007](#) (transfer of <cantorfx.cc>), which involved use of a similar domain name in a similar manner.

In the present case, the Complainant has shown evidence that the Disputed Domain Names have been used in connection with a website offering a fraudulent online currency and cryptocurrency exchange service, and that the Respondent has been using a header tab which holds that website out as being that of "Cantor Fitzgerald Group Ltd", which is likely to be connected with the Complainant and its substantial international business in financial services. It is clear from that, and from the Respondent's adoption of a domain name incorporating the Complainant's CANTOR Trademarks and the abbreviation "fx" for foreign exchange services, that the Respondent was targeting the Complainant when it registered the Disputed Domain Names.

[WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4, states that "the use of a domain name for per se illegitimate activity such as the sale of counterfeit goods or phishing can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent" and that "such behavior is manifestly considered evidence of bad faith". In addition, [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4, states that "the use of a domain name for purposes other than to host a website may constitute bad faith. Such purposes include sending email, phishing, identity theft, or malware distribution".

Accordingly, the Panel finds that Complainant has proven the third element of the UDRP.

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 Names <cantorukfx.com> and <cantor-us.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Douglas M. Isenberg/

Douglas M. Isenberg

Sole Panelist

Date: June 23, 2025