

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lennar Pacific Properties Management, LLC and Lennar Title, LLC v.
Bobbie Lisa
Case No. D2025-1979

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Bobbie Lisa, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lennartitle.com> ("Domain Name") is registered with GMO Internet, Inc. d/b/a Discount-Domain.com and Onamae.com (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 17, 2025. On May 19, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On May 20, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on May 20, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amendment to the Complaint on May 22, 2025.

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 proceedings commenced on May 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 12, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 13, 2025.

The Center appointed Elizabeth Ann Morgan as the sole panelist in this matter on June 17, 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 Complainants in this administrative proceeding are Lennar Pacific Properties Management, LLC (“LPPM”) and Lennar Title, LLC (“Lennar”), both Delaware entities. LPPM is the owner of federal trademark registrations for the LENNAR marks. Lennar Title is a related company and authorized licensee of the LENNAR marks and owns and operates the domain name and website “www.lennartitle.com” related to real estate and title services offered under the LENNAR marks.

This dispute concerns the Domain Name <lennartitle.com>. The Domain was registered on April 20, 2025.

LPPM is the owner of the following United States trademark registrations: LENNAR, U.S. Reg. No. 3,108,401; LENNAR, U.S. Reg. No. 3,477,143; and LENNAR TITLE, U.S. Reg. No. 6,817,154 (collectively, “LENNAR Marks”). Complainants have offered real estate management, brokerage, development, construction, mortgage, and financial services under the LENNAR Mark since at least as early as 1973. More specifically, Lennar has been one of America’s leading homebuilders since 1954 and builds and sells homes in twenty-one (21) states. In connection with these real estate and title services, Lennar owns and operates a website utilizing the LENNAR Marks, located at the domain name <lennartitle.com> (“Lennar Domain”). In addition, Complainants use the address “[...]@lennartitle.com” to conduct email correspondence for its business, including email correspondence that contains sensitive financial and personal information and instructions for activities such as home purchases and closing.

The Domain Name has been used by the Respondent to commit attempted wire fraud/theft via use of “[...]@lennartitle.com” as an email domain to trick Lennar’s consumers and lending institutions into wiring money for home purchases to a fraudulent account not associated with LENNAR.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Complainants contend Respondent’s registration of the Domain Name is virtually identical to and/or confusingly similar with the LENNAR Marks the sole difference being the addition of the letter “r” after “Lennar.” Complainants assert that when a domain name fully incorporates a complainant’s mark, this is sufficient to establish that the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar for purposes of the Policy. Further, the Complainants contend that the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith by the Respondent, including registration primarily for the purpose of disrupting Complainant’ business, as well as intentional use of the Domain Name to commit attempted wire fraud/theft via use of “[...]@lennartitle.com” as an email domain to trick Lennar’s consumers and lending institutions into wiring money for home purchases to a fraudulent account not associated with Lennar.

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 Complainants' 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.

The entirety of the LENNAR mark is reproduced within the Domain Name. Accordingly, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

A domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. The additional "r", does not prevent the Complainant's mark from being recognizable in the Domain Name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9.

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 Complainants have established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the 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, impersonating Complainants, presumably for fraud and commercial gain and to misleadingly divert Complainants' consumers, 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, 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 has used the Domain Name in bad faith to impersonate the Complainants and mislead and divert Complainants' customers for commercial gain pursuant to Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy. See also, [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the Domain Name constitutes bad faith under 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 Domain Name <lennarrtitle.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Elizabeth Ann Morgan/

Elizabeth Ann Morgan/

Sole Panelist

Date: June 25, 2025