ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Jones Lang LaSalle IP, Inc. v. Ember Hits
Case No. D2025-3886

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Ember Hits, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <jllcorp.life> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 24, 2025. On September 25, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 25, 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 Purposes, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 26, 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 September 26, 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 September 29, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 19, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 22, 2025.

The Center appointed Taras Kyslyy as the sole panelist in this matter on October 28, 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 wholly-owned subsidiary of Jones Lang LaSalle Incorporated. Jones Lang LaSalle Incorporated and all of its consolidated subsidiaries comprises the JLL group. The group's common stock is listed on The New York Stock Exchange under the symbol "JLL". Headquartered in Chicago, Illinois, USA, the JLL group is a professional services and investment management firm specializing in real estate. Its regional headquarters for the Americas, EMEA and Asia Pacific businesses are located in Chicago, London and Singapore, respectively. In 2023, the JLL group reported a revenue of USD 20.8 billion. The JLL group was formed in 1999, and since 2014, the Complainant has officially marketed itself under the name "JLL"

The Complainant is the owner of trademark registrations for JLL mark across various jurisdictions, including for instance the European Union registration No. 010603447, registration date August 31, 2012.

The JLL group has a large Internet presence and is the owner of numerous domain names, which incorporate the JLL trademark, including <jll.com>. It maintains 100 websites globally and in 2015, acquired the rights to use the dot-jll (.jll) Top-Level Domain ("TLD") names. The JLL group has a strong social media presence through the use of its Facebook, X and LinkedIn pages. Its X page (formerly known as Twitter) has over 82,500 followers while its Facebook page has over 169,000 "likes" and its LinkedIn page has 2 million followers.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 7, 2025 and redirects to the Complainant's official website.

The Complainant sent a cease and desist letter to the Respondent, however no reaction followed.

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 identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. It is standard practice when comparing the disputed domain name to the Complainant's trademark, to not take the extension into account. In creating the disputed domain name, the Respondent has added the generic, descriptive term "corp" to the Complainant's trademark, thereby making the disputed domain name confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. The fact that such term is closely linked and associated with the Complainant's trademark only serves to underscore and increase the confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark. A disputed domain name that consists merely of a complainant's trademark and an additional term that closely relates to and describes that complainant's business is confusingly similar to that complainant's trademarks. Additionally, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name contributes to the confusion. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to redirect to the Complainant's own website, which suggests that the Respondent intended the disputed domain name to be confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark as a means of furthering consumer confusion.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The Complainant has not given the Respondent permission to use the Complainant's trademarks in any manner,

including in domain names. The Respondent is identified as “Ember Hits”, which does not resemble the disputed domain name in any manner. Thus, there is no evidence suggesting that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, and the Respondent cannot be regarded as having acquired rights to or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. At the time of filing the Complaint, the Respondent was using a privacy WhoIs service, which equates to a lack of legitimate interest. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to the website of the Complainant. As such, the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name to provide a bona fide offering of goods or services. Use of a domain name to redirect Internet users to the Complainant’s own website cannot confer any rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. This is because the Respondent is not authorized to do so, and such conduct is inherently misleading. The Respondent also cannot claim nominative fair use of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is so closely similar to the Complainant’s trademark and therefore carries a high risk of implied affiliation or misrepresentation. While no evidence has been found that the disputed domain name was actively used as part of a fraud, the presence of Mail Exchanger (“MX”) records on the disputed domain name, coupled with the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name to redirect to the Complainant’s own website, strongly implies that the disputed domain name could be used as part of an email phishing scheme in the future. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on May 7, 2025, which is significantly after the Complainant filed for registration of its trademark. The sole intention of the Respondent is to mislead Internet users as to its affiliation with the Complainant and to trade off the Complainant’s rights and reputation in an attempt to facilitate fraudulent activities.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant and its trademark are known internationally, with trademark registrations across numerous countries. By registering the disputed domain name that comprises the Complainant’s trademark in its entirety in conjunction with a term that is merely descriptive of the Complainant, the Respondent has created the disputed domain name that is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademark. The Respondent has demonstrated a knowledge of and familiarity with the Complainant’s brand and business.

Moreover, the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name to redirect to the Complainant’s own website further reinforces the Respondent’s knowledge of the Complainant’s trademark. It is not possible to conceive of a plausible situation in which the Respondent would have been unaware of the Complainant’s brands at the time the disputed domain name was registered. Performing searches on Google search engine for “JLL CORP” returns multiple links referencing the Complainant and its business. The Respondent creates a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its trademark by registering the disputed domain name closely similar to the Complainant’s trademark, only to then redirect users to the Complainant’s official website. This demonstrates that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to confuse unsuspecting Internet users looking for the Complainant’s services, and to mislead Internet users as to the source of the disputed domain name and the website. Thus, by creating this likelihood of confusion between the Complainant’s trademark and the disputed domain name, leading to misperceptions as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the disputed domain name, the Respondent has demonstrated a nefarious intent to capitalize on the fame and goodwill of the Complainant’s trademarks. Redirecting the disputed domain name to the Complainant’s own website includes the risk that the Respondent may at any time cause Internet traffic to redirect to websites that are not that of, or associated with the Complainant. The fact disputed domain name has been set up with MX records, shows that the disputed domain name may be actively used for email purposes. The Respondent has ignored the Complainant’s attempts to resolve this dispute outside of this administrative proceeding. At the time of initial filing of the Complaint the Respondent had employed a privacy service to hide its identity. The physical address of the Respondent listed in the disclosed record does not point to a reachable location. Thus, the Respondent intentionally provided false details in the registration, perhaps as a way of avoiding detection and preventing concerned parties from contacting them.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the 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.

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 applicable generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") 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. Thus, the Panel disregards gTLD ".life" for the purposes of the confusing similarity test. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.11.1.

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, "corp", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such 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 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.

The available evidence does not confirm that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, which could demonstrate its rights or legitimate interests (see, e.g., *World Natural Bodybuilding Federation, Inc. v. Daniel Jones, TheDotCafe*, WIPO Case No. D2008-0642).

The Complainant did not license or otherwise agree for use of its prior registered trademarks by the Respondent, thus no actual or contemplated bona fide or legitimate use of the disputed domain name could be reasonably claimed (see, e.g., *Sportswear Company S.P.A. v. Tang Hong*, WIPO Case No. D2014-1875).

The use of the disputed domain name to redirect to the Complainant's official website does not constitute a legitimate noncommercial or fair use (see, e.g. *Allen & Overy LLP v. Can Kulah*, WIPO Case No. D2019-1147).

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark and applied redirection to the Complainant's official website. The Panel finds this confirms the Respondent when registering the disputed domain name was aware and targeted the Respondent and its trademark, which confirms the bad faith.

The use of the disputed domain name by way of redirection to the Complainant's website in combination with its established confusing features suggests that such use is in bad faith.

The Respondent failed to respond to the Complainant's cease and desist letters, and did not provide any good reason to justify this, which confirms the bad faith (see, e.g.*, Compagnie Generale des Etablissements Michelin v. Vaclav Novotny*, WIPO Case No. D2009-1022).

Moreover, the Respondent used a privacy service to register the disputed domain name. The use of a privacy or proxy service merely to avoid being notified of a UDRP proceeding, may support an inference of bad faith; a respondent filing or a response may refute such inference. However, no such response was provided by the Respondent. The Panel finds that such use of the privacy service here confirms registration of the disputed domain name in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.6.

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 and15of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <jllcorp.life> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Taras Kyslyy/
Taras Kyslyy
Sole Panelist
Date: October 31, 2025