

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ares Management, LLC v. Michael Jin
Case No. D2025-2698

1. The Parties

Complainant is Ares Management, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Greenberg Traurig, LLP, United States.

Respondent is Michael Jin, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <aresmgnt.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 8, 2025. On July 9, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 9, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name that differed from the named Respondent (“Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on July 11, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on the same date.

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 16, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 5, 2025.

Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on August 4, 2025, requesting an extension to respond to the Complaint under paragraph 5(b) of the Rules. On August 4, 2025, the Center wrote to Respondent, granting the automatic four calendar day extension for response under paragraph 5(b) of the Rules, indicating that the new due date was extended to August 9, 2025. No Response was submitted and there were no further communications from Respondent.

The Center appointed Jeffrey D. Steinhardt as sole panelist in this matter on August 15, 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 is a large, well-established investment asset management company with several thousand employees, a global presence, and a broad international trademark portfolio for the ARES family of marks. Trademark registrations in the United States for the ARES family of marks owned by Complainant include: United States Trademark Registration No. 3014171 (ARES), registered November 8, 2005; United States Trademark Registration No. 3925366 (ARES MANAGEMENT), registered March 1, 2011; and United States Trademark Registration No. 3925365 (ARES CAPITAL MANAGEMENT), registered March 1, 2011. Complainant also owns the domain name <aresmgmt.com>, registered in 2002, and in use by Complainant as of 2007 for its official website and for email communications.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 5, 2024, and currently resolves to a parking page provided by the Registrar. At the time of the filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to an AI-generated page by the Registrar under the title “Ares Management” and a “Launching Soon” message.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

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

Providing exhibits supporting its allegations, Complainant avers that Respondent attempted to configure the disputed domain name for email use. Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name is similar to various other domain names that Complainant uses as communications channels with its customers and that Respondent likely sought the mail exchange (“MX”) configuration for email use of the disputed domain name with the intention of impersonating Complainant in fraudulent or misleading communications.

Complainant also avers that its counsel sent a cease and desist notice to Respondent via the Registrar, requesting transfer of the disputed domain name, and that no response to the notice was received.

B. Respondent

As noted above, although Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on August 4, 2025 requesting an extension to submit a Response, Respondent did not reply to Complainant’s contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

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.

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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, “mgnt”) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of that term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel finds that the first element of Policy paragraph 4(a) has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which a 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.

The Panel accepts Complainant’s unopposed allegations that Respondent has no authorization to make use of Complainant’s marks in the disputed domain name and that Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. In this case, the evidence shows that Respondent registered a disputed domain name confusingly similar to Complainant’s registered marks (and a misspelled version of Complainant’s domain name) and attempted to enable its use to make email communications. Moreover, the disputed domain name has merely resolved to a “Launching Soon” page and Registrar parking page. On the record before the Panel, the Panel finds that such use of the disputed domain name is not *bona fide*.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that Complainant has established a *prima facie* case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

The Panel finds that the second element of Policy paragraph 4(a) 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.

In the present case, as noted above, Respondent registered the confusingly similar disputed domain name and sought to enable its use for email communications without authorization of Complainant, the trademark holder.

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 (including a blank or “coming soon” page) 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 and reputation of Complainant’s trademarks. The Panel also notes that the composition of the disputed domain name includes the term “mgnt” a misspelled version of Complainant’s domain name and a variant of the common abbreviation for the word “management” (“mgmt”). In fact, Complainant’s name and trademarks also include the term “management.” The Panel finds that the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel concludes that Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith by targeting Complainant’s marks and domain name. Respondent’s failure to respond to the Complaint, even after requesting and receiving an extension of the deadline, further supports a finding of bad faith in this case.

The Panel finds that the third element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

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 <aresmgnt.com> be transferred to Complainant.

*/Jeffrey D. Steinhardt/
Jeffrey D. Steinhardt
Sole Panelist
Date: August 28, 2025*