

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Cantor Fitzgerald Securities v. Jefferson Lawrence, cfsecured
Case No. D2025-0743

1. The Parties

Complainant is Cantor Fitzgerald Securities, United States of America (hereinafter “United States”), represented by Akerman LLP, United States.

Respondent is Jefferson Lawrence, cfsecured, United States, self-represented.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <cfsecuredholdingsllc.com> (hereinafter the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 23, 2025. On February 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On February 24, 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 / PRIVACY SERVICE PROVIDED BY WITHHELD FOR PRIVACY EHF) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on February 26, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on February 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 28, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 24, 2025. Respondent sent email communications to the Center on March 21, 2025 requesting for an extension to file the Response. On March 24, 2025, the Center confirmed that the Response due was extended to March 24, 2025, under paragraph 5(b) of the Rules. On the same day,

Respondent sent an email communication to the Center requesting for further extension to file the Response without specifying the requested extension period. On March 26, 2025, Complainant sent an email communication to the Center indicating its objection of Respondent's additional extension request. On March 31, 2025, the Center informed the Parties of the Response due date was extended to April 1, 2025 in accordance with paragraph 5(e) of the Rules. Respondent did not submit any formal response by April 1, 2025.

The Center appointed Lawrence K. Nodine as the sole panelist in this matter on April 8, 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

Formed over 75 years ago, Complainant is a well-known financial services company. Complainant has over 1,800 employees serving more than 5,000 institutional clients in 35 locations around the globe. Complainant provides financial services, including broker-dealer, domestic and international equities, fixed income and currencies, real estate, and investment banking services. Complainant's services include computer-based bond brokerage. Complainant is a dealer of United States government agency and treasury securities, credit securities, asset-backed and mortgage-backed securities, and emerging market credit securities.

Complainant advertises extensively and has been the subject of numerous third-party media articles, as evidence.

Complainant owns a number of business divisions, affiliates, products, and services under the names Cantor Fitzgerald, Cantor or CF (short for Cantor Fitzgerald), including, most pertinent here, CF Secured LLC, which is a registered broker dealer with the United States Securities and Exchange Commission and with the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority (FINRA). Complainant owns and uses the name and mark CFSECURED (hereinafter the "Mark") for a variety of services, including securities lending, repo, prime brokerage margin financing and fully paid lending to prime brokerage clients.

Complainant owns trademark registrations for the Mark, including:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 6251795 (registered January 19, 2021);
- Canadian Trademark Registration No. TMA1287005 (registered January 24, 2025);
- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00003360348 (registered March 8, 2019).

Complainant sometimes combines the Mark with a logo:



Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name on December 27, 2024. The Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website (hereinafter sometimes the "Disputed Website") for CF Secured Holdings LLC company, which promotes a purported fund and asset recovery service to recover lost investments and funds from fraudulent transactions.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

Notably, Complainant contends that Respondent uses the Disputed Website to impersonate Complainant to perpetrate fraud. The contact information posted on the Disputed Website is a copy of Complainant's address in New York City. The "Legals" page on the Disputed Website includes a subtitle "Compliance with Regulatory Standards" that links to Complainant's regulatory disclosures that are posted on the FINRA website. The Disputed Website also links to regulatory disclosures that Complainant has made on its website at "www.cantor.com" for its CF Secured LLC Company.

Complainant submits evidence that Respondent has used an email address that incorporates the Disputed Domain Name to send a fake invoice for "financial recovery services" to an individual who reported the fake invoice to Complainant. The submitted email evidence includes Complainant's physical address.

B. Respondent

Although Respondent requested and received an extension of time to respond to the Complaint, Respondent did not file a formal response.

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 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.

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 entirety of the Mark is reproduced and recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name. The addition of "holdingsllc" 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.

Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [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 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here, claimed phishing, impersonation/passing off and 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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here phishing, impersonation/passing off, and fraud, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that 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 <cfsecuredholdingsllc.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Lawrence K. Nodine/

Lawrence K. Nodine

Sole Panelist

Date: April 22, 2025