

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lennar Pacific Properties Management, LLC, and Lennar Corporation v. Rita Namatovu
Case No. D2025-4790

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Lennar Pacific Properties Management, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), and Lennar Corporation, United States, represented by Slates Harwell Campbell, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Rita Namatovu, Uganda.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lennarcorporation.org> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 18, 2025. On November 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 20, 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 (The RDAP server redacted the value, Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on November 20, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amendment to the Complaint on November 26, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 November 27, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 17, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 18, 2025.

The Center appointed Daniel Kraus as the sole panelist in this matter on December 22, 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 Complainants are related companies. The Complainant Lennar Corporation provides homebuilding services across the United States under the LENNAR mark. The Complainants offer real estate, development, mortgage, financial, and brokerage services in connection with the construction and sale of homes under the LENNAR mark. The Complainant Lennar Pacific Properties Management, LLC owns two registrations for the LENNAR mark:

- United States trademark Reg. No. 3108401, registered June 27, 2006, for real estate development, mortgage, and planning services, among other things.
- United States trademark Reg. No. 3477143, registered July 29, 2008, for real estate-related services, including management, listing, and construction services.

The Complainant Lennar Corporation operates a website at the <lennar.com> domain name.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 5, 2025. It redirects to the Complainants' website. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainants.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name. Notably, the Complainants contend that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to their trademarks, noting that it incorporates the entirety of their trademark.

Furthermore, the Complainants assert that:

- there is no evidence that the Respondent has demonstrated any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and in particular that there is no evidence of the Respondent using the disputed domain name (or having demonstrable plans for such use) as part of a bona fide offering of goods or services;
- there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name; and
- there is no indication either that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name constitutes a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, not least since they state that there is no prior relationship between the Parties, nor have the Complainants ever licensed or otherwise authorised the Respondent to use the LENNAR mark.

Finally, the Complainants contend that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, specifically that the disputed domain name was registered with the intent to attract and/or divert, for commercial gain, Internet users and create further confusion with respect to the Complainants' mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the disputed domain name, which warrants a finding of bad faith. In particular, the Respondent's primary purpose is to disrupt the Complainants' business, as well as the intentional use of the disputed domain name to send fake inquiries and purchase order requests, as the Respondent has been using the disputed domain name to spoof legitimate email addresses and impersonate the Complainants' employees, to fraudulently redirect funds and/or materials

and parts. Moreover, the fact that the disputed domain name redirects customers to the Complainants' own website is bad faith. Specifically, use of the disputed domain name to redirect to the Complainants' own official website demonstrates an attempt to create a false impression of legitimacy and to benefit from potential user confusion.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainants' contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

To prevail under the Policy a complainant must prove, as to the domain name at issue, that: (a) it is identical or confusingly similar to a mark in which the complainant has rights, (b) respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect to it, and (c) it has been registered and is being used in bad faith. Policy, paragraph 4(a). A respondent's failure to respond does not automatically result in a finding for the complainant; the complainant continues to have the burden of establishing each element. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.3. The Panel may, however, draw appropriate inferences from the default. See Rules, paragraph 14(b).

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 Complainants' 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 Complainants have 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 LENNAR 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 the word "corporation" 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 Complainants have established a *prima facie* case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainants' *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 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 has intentionally used the disputed domain name to send fake inquiries and purchase order requests with an email address impersonating the Complainants' employees, to fraudulently redirect funds and/or materials and parts. Furthermore, the disputed domain name redirects customers to the Complainants' own website. Panels have held that such use of a domain name for illegal activity, such as phishing and impersonation, constitutes bad faith under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainants have 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 name <lennarcorporation.org> be transferred to the Complainants.

/Daniel Kraus/
Daniel Kraus
Sole Panelist
Date: January 5, 2026