

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Cantor Fitzgerald Securities v. Nickname Jo Doe  
Case No. D2026-0878

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Cantor Fitzgerald Securities, United States of America (“United States” or “U.S.”), represented by Akerman LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Nickname Jo Doe, United States.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

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

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 27, 2026. On February 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 27, 2026, 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 (USER #C30F37BB, Privacy, SEE PRIVACYGUARDIAN.ORG) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 2, 2026, 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 March 4, 2026.

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 March 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 25, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 26, 2026.

The Center appointed Kathryn Lee as the sole panelist in this matter on April 2, 2026. 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 financial services firm founded in 1945, providing broker-dealer, domestic and international equities, fixed income and currencies, real estate, and investment banking services. The Complainant now has over 1,800 employees in 35 locations around the world and serves more than 5,000 institutional clients. The Complainant has used CANTOR and CANTOR FITZGERALD on their own as well as in combination with other terms to promote its business divisions, affiliates, products, and services. The Complainant operates in Japan through its affiliate Cantor Fitzgerald Securities Japan Co., Ltd.

The Complainant owns a number of trademark registrations for the CANTOR and CANTOR FITZGERALD marks, including the following:

CANTOR: United States Trademark Registration Number 2682690 registered on February 4, 2003; European Union Trademark Registration Number 003380541 registered on January 21, 2005; United Kingdom Trademark Registration Number UK00903380541 registered on January 21, 2005; and China Trademark Registration Number 6147038 registered on November 28, 2010.

CANTOR FITZGERALD: United States Trademark Registration Number 2682691 registered on February 4, 2003; European Union Trademark Registration Number 003283041 registered on February 1, 2005; United Kingdom Trademark Registration Number UK00903283041 registered on February 1, 2005; and China Trademark Registration Number 14280972 registered on May 14, 2015.

In the information provided by the Registrar, the Respondent is identified as “Nickname Jo Doe” with an address in the United States.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 1, 2026, and, at one point, resolved to a website falsely purporting to be that of Cantor Fitzgerald, L.P. The website prominently displayed the Complainant’s CANTOR logo mark and its U.S. address, and invited visitors via Japanese-language forms to submit their contact information for purported investment inquiries.

#### **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 confusingly similar to the CANTOR FITZGERALD mark in which it has rights since the disputed domain name is simply the Complainant’s mark with the geographical suffix “jp” added to the end.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and confirms that it has not authorized or licensed rights to the Respondent in any respect. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent’s use of the CANTOR and CANTOR FITZGERALD marks and its impersonation of the Complainant is not legitimate interest or bona fide use.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant contends that given the fact that the Respondent sought to pass itself off as the Complainant, it is clear that the Respondent targeted the Complainant in registering the disputed domain name. The Complainant also contends that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name which includes the geographical abbreviation "jp" for Japan for a fake website targeting Japanese consumers constitutes fraudulent use in bad faith, especially since the Complainant has had an office in Japan since 1986 through an affiliate registered under the name Cantor Fitzgerald Securities Japan Co., Ltd.

## **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 Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms – here, "jp" – 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 3.1](#), 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 that 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 3.1](#), 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.

Moreover, “UDRP panels have found that domain names identical to a complainant’s trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation. Even where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term (at the second- or top-level), UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner”. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. Here, the geographical term “jp” is added after the CANTOR FITZGERALD mark which, coupled with the impersonating use of the disputed domain name, may mislead Internet users into believing that the website at the disputed domain name is related to and/or operated by the Complainant’s affiliate in Japan, contrary to the fact.

Furthermore, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to display a website claiming to be that of the Complainant and asking visitors to submit personal information to obtain financial services. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity – here, claimed passing off – can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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 containing the Complainant’s mark, and linked it to a website purporting to be that of the Complainant. Based on this use, it is highly unlikely for the Respondent to have registered the disputed domain name by chance. Rather, the Panel finds that the Respondent most likely was aware of the Complainant and its trademark and targeted the Complainant by registering the disputed domain name.

Panels have also held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity – here, claimed passing off – constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 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 name <cantorfitzgeraldjp.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Kathryn Lee/*

**Kathryn Lee**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 9, 2026