

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Cantor Fitzgerald Securities v. 石磊 (Shi Lei)
Case No. D2025-1596

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is 石磊 (Shi Lei), China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <cantorfinancialservice.com>, and <cantorfitzgeraldfinacial.com> are registered with Cloud Yuqu LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 21, 2025. On April 22, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On April 23, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 24, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed the amended Complaints in English on April 24, 2025, and April 25, 2025.

On April 24, 2024, the Center informed the parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On April 24, 2025, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 28, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 18, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 21, 2025.

The Center appointed Tao Sun as the sole panelist in this matter on May 23, 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 global financial service provider formed over 75 years ago. Its services include, without limitation, broker-dealer, domestic and international equities, fixed income and currencies, real estate, and investment banking services. The Complainant has over 1,800 employees serving more than 5,000 institutional clients in 35 locations around the globe.

The Complaint has extensively advertised and promoted its CANTOR and CANTOR FITZGERALD marks through various channels

The Complainant owns, among others, the following registered trademarks:

- (i) The United States registration No. 2682690 CANTOR in international class 36, registered on February 4, 2003;
- (ii) The United States registration No. 2682691 CANTOR FITZGERALD in international class 36, registered on February 4, 2003; and
- (iii) The Chinese registration No. 6147038 CANTOR in class 36, registered on November 28, 2010.

The Complainant owns and has used the domain name <cantor.com> since at least as early as 1998 in connection with a website regarding the Complainant's financial services.

The disputed domain names were registered on November 19, 2024. According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the disputed domain names were resolved to the websites with pay-per-click ("PPC") promoting links to financial services such as "Financial Loans," "Finance Investment Advisor". The disputed domain names were also listed in the GoDaddy website for sale.

The Respondent is reportedly a Chinese individual. He is also the respondent of other UDRP cases (e.g., *LEGO Juris A/S v. 石磊 (Lei Shi)*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-1663](#); *Equifax Inc. v. 石磊 (Lei Shi)*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-3282](#); *Mizuho Financial Group, Inc. v. 石磊 (Lei Shi)*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0670](#); *Intuit Inc. v. 石磊 (Lei Shi)*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-4524](#); *Telefonaktiebolaget LMEricsson v. 石磊 (Lei Shi)*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-5076](#); and *Sodexo v. 石磊 (Lei Shi)*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-3214](#).) In all of these cases, the complaints were supported by panels and the disputed domain names were ordered to be transferred to relevant complainants.

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

- (i) The disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's marks, as they consist of an exact copy of the Complainant's CANTOR or CANTOR FITZGERALD marks. The addition of the words "financial service" or a misspelling of "financial" at the tail of the disputed domain names does not distinguish the disputed domain names from the Complainant's marks.
- (ii) The disputed domain names are not, nor could it be contended to be, a legitimate name or nickname of the Respondent, nor are they in any other way identified with or related to any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent. There is no relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent giving rise to any license, permission, or other right by which the Respondent could own or use any domain name incorporating the exact CANTOR or CANTOR FITZGERALD marks. The Respondent is neither using the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services nor making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names.
- (iii) The Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith for commercial gain and to benefit from the goodwill and notoriety associated with the Complainant's marks.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Issues: Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain names is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the facts that disputed domain names consist of English words, and the contents on the websites associated with the disputed domain names are in English, suggesting that the Respondent is likely proficient in English.

The Respondent did not make any submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, and noting that the Center sent the emails in Chinese and English regarding the notification of the Complaint which includes information on the language of the proceeding, the Respondent did not make any comments on the language of the proceeding, and did not file any response, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2. Substantive Issues

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 names. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain names contain the Complainant's CANTOR mark in its entirety, and one of the disputed domain names also contains the Complainant's CANTOR FITZGERALD mark in its entirety. The Complainant's marks can be easily recognized within the disputed domain names. Therefore, the disputed domain names should be considered confusingly similar with the Complainant's trademarks for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms "financial service" and "finacial" 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 names and the Complainant's marks 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Complainant has asserted that it has no relationship with the Respondent. According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the disputed domain names were resolved to the websites with "related search" links to "Financial Loans," "Finance Investment Advisor," etc. Such use of the disputed domain names to host a parked page does not represent a bona fide offering of goods or services where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant's marks or otherwise mislead Internet users, especially when the "searched" items are closely related to the Complainant's major business of financial services. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9.

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.

The Panel therefore 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 Complainant's trademarks are inherently distinctive and has acquired high reputation through extensive use. The disputed domain names contain the entirety of the Complainant's CANTOR and CANTOR FITZGERALD trademarks with the addition of "financial service" or "finacial." Therefore, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's famous marks and were registered by the Respondent who has no relationship with the Complainant, which can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

Furthermore, the fact that the disputed domain names are resolved to the parking websites with links to services competing with the Complainant without the authorization of the Complainant can also prove that the Respondent has attempted to attract Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks. Such uses undoubtedly constitute bad faith under the paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

In addition, the disputed domain names are also listed on GoDaddy website for sale. Considering the Respondent has no rights to or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, such offer for sale of the disputed domain names can also demonstrate the bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.1.

Last but not the least, the Respondent had registered many other domain names which had been ordered to be transferred to the complainants by panels in prior UDRP cases. The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent is engaged in a pattern of abusive domain name registrations incorporating the famous trademarks including the Complainant's trademarks, and this case is a continuation of that bad faith pattern. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.2.

The Respondent's failure to file any response also supports a finding of bad faith.

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 <cantorfinancialservice.com> and <cantorfitzgeraldfinacial.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Tao Sun/

Tao Sun

Sole Panelist

Date: June 6, 2025