

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lennar Pacific Properties Management, LLC and Lennar Title, LLC v. Melissa smith, Island Properties
Case No. DCC2026-0003

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Melissa smith, Island Properties, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lennartitle.cc> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 13, 2026. On March 16, 2026, the Center transmitted to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 16, 2026, the Registrar transmitted to the Center its verification response disclosing the registrant and its contact information for the disputed domain name, which differed from the named Respondent (Privacy User #30bd20d5, See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information stated in the Complaint. On March 17, 2026, the Center notified the Complainants, with a copy to the Respondent, of the registrant and its contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and invited the Complainants to amend the Complaint adding the newly identified registrant. On the same date, the Complainants filed an amendment to the Complaint.

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 amended Complaint, and the proceeding commenced on March 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for the Response was April 7, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, on April 8, 2026, the Center notified the Respondent's default.

The Center appointed Professor Ilhyung Lee as the sole panelist in this matter on April 13, 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 Complainants describe themselves as businesses that have “offered real estate management, brokerage, development, construction, mortgage, and financial services under the LENNAR Mark since at least as early as 1973”. The Complainant Lennar Pacific Properties Management, LLC owns multiple LENNAR marks in the United States (e.g., registration number 3,108,401, registered on June 27, 2006 (LENNAR); registration number 3,477,143, registered on July 29, 2008 (LENNAR); and registration number 6,817,154, registered on August 16, 2022 (LENNAR TITLE)).

The Complaint states that the Complainant Lennar Title, LLC “owns and operates a website utilizing the LENNAR Mark” at the domain name <lennartitle.com> (registered on June 12, 2020).

The disputed domain name was registered on February 4, 2026. At the time of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a site containing pay-per-click links.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants contend principally that: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a mark in which the Complainants have rights; (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. In addition, the Complaint states, inter alia:

“Lennar has been one of America’s leading homebuilders since 1954 and builds and sells homes in twenty-one ... states in the United States. Under the LENNAR Mark, Complainants offer real estate, construction, mortgage, financial, and brokerage services in connection with the construction and sale of homes.”

“Lennar sent cease and desist correspondence to Respondent on February 9, 2026 regarding registration of the [disputed] [d]omain [name], and [the] Respondent has failed to respond to date or otherwise provide any explanation regarding registration or use of the [disputed] [d]omain [name].”

“[T]he [disputed] [d]omain [name] appears to and/or has at one point in time redirected visitors to a malicious pop-up scam with illegal streaming content and/or virus scam site.”

“[I]t appears that the [disputed] [d]omain [name] has been, at one point in time, used as a malicious phishing website and/or pop-up scam with illegal streaming content and/or virus scam site, clearly evidencing bad faith.”

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainants’ contentions. Under paragraphs 5(f) and 14(a) of the Rules, the Panel may decide the dispute based on the Complaint. Paragraph 14(b) allows the Panel to draw appropriate inferences from the Respondent’s default.

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 Complainants' trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainants have shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Complainants' LENNAR mark, as well as their LENNAR TITLE mark, is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the mark for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The country-code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".cc", a technical registration requirement, is disregarded in the consideration of this element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that 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 that the Complainants have established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Thus, the burden of production shifts to the Respondent to demonstrate any such rights or legitimate interests. Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances that may demonstrate the Respondent's rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Respondent has defaulted. It 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 is unable to ascertain any evidence that would demonstrate the Respondent's rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the Complainants must show that the disputed domain name “has been registered and is being used in bad faith”. Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances that can satisfy this element. Other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

At the time of the Complaint, Internet users resorting to the disputed domain name were taken to a website with pay-per-click links for, inter alia, “Homeowners Insurance Policy”, “Home Owner Insurances”, “Property Insurance”, and “Apply for a Loan”, all of which suggest some connection with the Complainants’ business operations. The Panel determines that this is evidence that the Respondent has “intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the Respondent’s] website ... by creating a likelihood of confusion with the [C]omplainant[s]’ mark”, as set forth in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of 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 <lennartitle.cc> be transferred to the Complainants.

/Ilhyung Lee/

Ilhyung Lee

Sole Panelist

Date: April 21, 2026