

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Alan Dershowitz v. Fei Xie, Lee Andy, Zhong Xiao  
Case No. D2024-5327

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Alan Dershowitz, United States of America (“U.S.”), represented by Cyber Law Firm, PLLC, U.S.

The Respondent is Fei Xie, China; Lee Andy, U.S.; Zhong Xiao, U.S.

### **2. The Domain Names and Registrars**

The disputed domain names <alandershowitzlawfirm.com> and <alandershowitzlawfirms.com> are registered with NameSilo, LLC.

The disputed domain name <alandershowitzllp.com> is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd.

The disputed domain name <alanlawfirm.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC.

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 27, 2024. On December 30, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On December 30, 2024 and on December 31, 2024, respectively, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 8, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on January 13, 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<sup>1</sup> of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 14, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 3, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 6, 2025.

The Center appointed Adam Taylor as the sole panelist in this matter on February 10, 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 high-profile lawyer who trades under his name ALAN DERSHOWITZ. He has authored books on politics and law, received awards for his legal work, and made frequent media appearances as an authority on U.S. constitutional law. The Complainant’s YouTube channel, “The Dershow with Alan Dershowitz” has over 127,000 followers, with videos reaching over 250,000 viewers. The Complainant has over 450,000 followers on Twitter/X.

The disputed domain names were registered on the following dates:

<alandershowitzlawfirm.com> - March 11, 2024  
<alandershowitzllp.com> - July 29, 2024  
<alanlawfirm.com> - September 17, 2024  
<alandershowitzlawfirms.com> - November 8, 2024

The Respondent has used the disputed domain names <alandershowitzlawfirm.com>, <alandershowitzlawfirms.com>, and <alandershowitzllp.com> to resolve to virtually identical purported law firm websites, all headed with an “Alan Dershowitz” logo and entitled: “We Are Best Law Firm Since 1999”. The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name <alanlawfirm.com> previously resolved to similar content, but subsequently became faulty and only occasionally resolved to an active website. At the time of the decision, the disputed domain name <alanlawfirm.com> does not resolve to an active website.

The disputed domain name <alandershowitzlawfirm.com> has been described as the official website of “Alan Dershowitz Law Firm” in at least two likely phishing/scam emails sent in August/September 2024, by a purported lawyer at the alleged firm.

#### **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 names.

##### **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Respondents are collectively referred to hereafter as “the Respondent”, unless it is necessary to refer to them separately.

## 6. Discussion and Findings

### Consolidation: Multiple Respondents – Preliminary Issue

The Panel is satisfied that the disputed domain names are subject to common control and that, in the circumstances, consolidation is fair and equitable to all parties, and also procedurally efficient. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)), section 4.11.

In particular, the Panel notes that:

1. three of the disputed domain names resolve to virtually identical websites;
2. the fourth disputed domain name <alanlawfirm.com> is referenced in the code of the website at the disputed domain name <alandershowitzllp.com>;
3. the Whois information for all four disputed domain names includes purportedly fake contact details; and,
4. none of the Respondents have come forward to deny common control.

### 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 trade mark 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 Panel finds the Complainant has established unregistered trade mark or service mark rights in the mark ALAN DERSHOWITZ for the purposes of the Policy arising from the Complainant’s use of his name in commerce as a designation of source including in connection with his activities as a supplier of legal services and as an author. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.3 and 1.5.2.

The Panel finds the mark is recognisable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are 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, “law firm”, “law firms”, “LLP”) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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.

While the disputed domain names <alanlawfirm.com> omits the term “dershowitz”, nonetheless the Panel considers that the overall facts and circumstances of the case support a finding of confusing similarity, particularly as it appears that the Respondent registered this disputed domain name as part of a scheme to impersonate the Complainant for fraudulent purposes, as further discussed under the third element below. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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 recognised 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed impersonation/passing off and/or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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.

The Complainant has produced extensive evidence indicating that the disputed domain names have been used to impersonate the Complainant in order to capitalise on his fame for fraudulent purposes. See section 4 above.

While the Panel is not clear precisely how the disputed domain name <alanlawfirm.com> has been used in this context, it is plainly part of the same illegal scheme as the other disputed domain names and, even if it is not currently being actively used, the Panel nonetheless considers that the disputed domain name <alanlawfirm.com> constitutes a passive holding in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

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 names <alandershowitzlawfirm.com>, <alandershowitzlawfirms.com>, <alandershowitzllp.com>, and <alanlawfirm.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Adam Taylor/*

**Adam Taylor**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 24, 2025