

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ares Management LLC v. Ailxsp, Ailxsp, its, its
Case No. D2025-2626

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Ares Management LLC, United States of America, represented by Greenberg Traurig, LLP, United States of America.

The First Respondent is Ailxsp, Ailxsp, Singapore.

The Second Respondent is its, its, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <aresmanagemeeent.com> and <aresmanagemaint.com> are registered with Dominet (HK) Limited (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 3, 2025. On July 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 7, 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 (Unknown Registrant) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 7, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar(s), requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 9, 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 July 9, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 29, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 30, 2025.

The Center appointed Benoit Van Asbroeck as the sole panelist in this matter on August 20, 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 a global alternative asset manager headquartered in the United States with over 40 global offices, including in Europe, Asia, the Middle East, and Australia.

The Complainant is the owner of registered trademarks in the marks ARES and ARES MANAGEMENT, among which:

- Singapore Trademark No. 4020308848P for ARES, registered on April 24, 2023, in International Classes 36 and 37;
- Hong Kong Trademark No. 301668376 for ARES MANAGEMENT, registered on July 20, 2010, in International Class 36; and
- United States Trademark No. 3,925,366 for ARES MANAGEMENT, registered on March 1, 2011, in International Class 36.

In addition, the Complainant owns domain names containing the ARES and ARES MANAGEMENT marks, including <aresmgmt.com> and <aresmanagement.com>.

Both disputed domain names were recently registered in 2025, well after the Complainant secured rights in the marks. Both disputed domain names are currently inactive.

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.

With respect to the first element, the Complainant contends that it has rights in the marks ARES and ARES MANAGEMENT and that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to these marks. According to the Complainant, the disputed domain names incorporate the ARES and ARES MANAGEMENT marks in full, changing the mark only by adding an extra letter "e" or "i" in the word "management". The Complainant points out that this amounts to "typo-squatting".

Regarding the second element, the Complainant claims that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use and is not making preparations for such use. In particular, the Complainant points to the fact that disputed domain names do not resolve to an active website and are therefore passively held by the Respondent. Furthermore, the Complainant notes that they have not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to register and/or use the disputed domain names. In addition, the Complainant

puts forward that, to their knowledge, there are no prior trademark applications or registrations in the name of the Respondent for any mark incorporating the term “ARES” or ARES MANAGEMENT anywhere in the world. Finally, the Complainant points out that, based on the WHOIS registrant information, there is no evidence on record indicating that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names.

As for the third element, the Complainant relies on the passive holding doctrine to contend that the passive holding of the disputed domain names amounts to bad faith. In that regard, the Complainant notes that the ARES and ARES MANAGEMENT marks have a strong reputation and are substantially used worldwide. In addition, the Complainant claims that while the disputed domain names do not publicly resolve to content they may still allow authorized persons to view content. In particular, the Complainant points out, the Respondent may be using the disputed domain names in bad faith with respect to those specifically authorized to view this content or in email addresses based on the disputed domain names.

In addition, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent had actual knowledge of the Complainant’s ARES and ARES MANAGEMENT marks. In fact, they claim, the Respondent’s actual knowledge of the Complainant’s ARES and ARES MANAGEMENT marks is the entire reason behind the Respondent’s registration of the disputed domain names. Furthermore, the Complainant points out, the mere fact that the Respondent has registered domain names that incorporate the trademark of a well-known company alone is sufficient to give rise to an inference of bad faith. Moreover, the Complainant submits that the Respondent also had constructive knowledge of the Complainant’s marks because of the Complainant’s registration of its marks in Singapore, Hong Kong, and multiple other countries. In addition, the Complainant mentions that it gave notice to the Respondent to which it did not receive any response. Finally, the Complainant contends that the Respondent used false and/or inaccurate contact information in the registration of the disputed domain names.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant’s request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant’s request, the Panel will consider whether: (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See [WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition \(“WIPO Overview 3.0”\)](#), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Complainant has convincingly demonstrated that: (i) the disputed domain names are highly similar in their domain name structure by adding an additional vowel to the word “management”; (ii) the disputed domain names were registered through the same registrar less than a month apart; (iii) the disputed domain names use the same nameservers; (iv) the disputed domain names are hosted on the same IP address located in Phnom Penh, Cambodia; (v) both disputed domain names use similar registrant contact information including random nonsensical letters for the registrant’s name (i.e.,

“Ailxsp” and “its”); and (vi) both disputed domain names omit any street address information and instead use “SGP” and “xg” respectively.

The Panel believes that these circumstances, in combination with the absence of a response from the disputed domain name registrants, sufficiently indicate that the disputed domain names are under common control. With respect to fairness and equity, since the disputed domain name registrants have not responded to this Complaint and splitting the Complaint would not be beneficial to procedural efficiency, the Panel finds that consolidation of the Complaint would be fair and equitable to all parties concerned and grants the Complainant's request.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as “the Respondent”) in a single proceeding.

B. 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 the trademarks ARES and ARES MANAGEMENT for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the ARES mark is reproduced in both disputed domain names. In addition, the ARES MANAGEMENT mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. The Panel finds that the addition of the letters “e” or “i” does not diminish the confusingly similarity. The addition of these letters in the disputed domain names can be considered an intentional misspelling of the Complainant's trademarks and the Complainant's domain name <aresmanagement.com>. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7 and 1.9.

Finally, as for the applicable gTLD “.com”, the Panel holds that this can be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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

C. 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel finds that the Respondent does not use, and has not made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of services and neither makes a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. There is a risk of implied affiliation here since the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks. The overall facts and circumstances of the case do not show a bona fide offering of services or legitimate noncommercial or fair use either.

Moreover, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has not been commonly known by the disputed domain names prior to or after the registration of the disputed domain names or that they own any trademarks or other rights in these marks. The Panel notes that the Respondent failed to respond to the Complaint and the evidence on record therefore does not contain any evidence of the same either. In addition, the Complainant confirmed that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant in any way nor has the Complainant licensed, authorized, or permitted the Respondent to register domain names incorporating the Complainant's trademarks. The Panel has taken note of the Complainant's confirmation in this regard and has not seen any evidence that would suggest the contrary. Noting the composition of the disputed domain names, in the absence of any license or permission from the Complainant to use its trademarks, no actual or contemplated bona fide or legitimate use of the disputed domain name could reasonably be claimed (see, e.g., *Sportswear Company S.P.A. v. Tang Hong*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-1875](#); and *LEGO Juris A/S v. DomainPark Ltd, David Smith, Above.com Domain Privacy, Transure Enterprise Ltd, Host master*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-0138](#)).

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

D. 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.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's ARES and ARES MANAGEMENT trademarks as well as the composition of the disputed domain names, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Moreover, given the composition of them, the Panel believes that the Respondent plainly knew at the time of registration that the disputed domain names included the Complainant's ARES and ARES MANAGEMENT trademarks. The Complainant demonstrated that its ARES and ARES MANAGEMENT trademarks were registered many years before the registration of the disputed domain names in several countries, including in Hong Kong and Singapore, where the registrants are purportedly located. In addition, the disputed domain names incorporate the ARES trademark in its entirety and the ARES MANAGEMENT trademark is clearly recognizable in both disputed domain names. All of these facts indicate that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's ARES and ARES MANAGEMENT trademarks and its activities. In addition, the Panel takes into consideration that the Complainant gave notice to the Respondent to which it did not receive any response and the Respondent's use of false and/or inaccurate contact information in the registration of the disputed domain names. The Respondent's registration in bad faith of the disputed domain names may accordingly also be inferred from these circumstances. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element 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 names <aresmanagemeent.com> and <aresmanagemeint.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Benoit Van Asbroeck/

Benoit Van Asbroeck

Sole Panelist

Date: September 2, 2025