

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Jones Lang LaSalle IP, Inc. v. Anita Butler  
Case No. D2025-2251

### **1. The Parties**

Complainant is Jones Lang LaSalle IP, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

Respondent is Anita Butler, United States.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <usajll.com> (the "Domain Name") is registered with Wix.com Ltd. (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 10, 2025. On June 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On June 19, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 13, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on July 16, 2025.

The Center appointed Kimberley Chen Nobles as the sole panelist in this matter on July 21, 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**

Complainant is a wholly owned subsidiary of Jones Lang LaSalle incorporated, that latter of which together with all of its consolidated subsidiaries, comprise the JLL group. Since 2014, Complainant has marketed itself under the name “JLL”. The JLL group is a professional services and investment management firm specializing in property and corporate facility management services, with a global workforce of over 106,000 individuals, serving clients in over 80 countries from more than 310 corporate office locations worldwide. LaSalle Investment Management, Complainant’s investment management business, has USD 73.9 billion of assets under management. In 2023, the JLL group reported revenues of USD 20.8 billion.

Complainant owns numerous registered trademarks for the JLL mark, including:

- European Union registered trademark number 010603447, for the JLL word mark, registered on August 31, 2012;
- United Kingdom registered trademark number UK00910603447, for the JLL word mark, registered on August 31, 2012; and
- United States registered trademark number 4564654, for the JLL word mark, registered on July 8, 2014.

Complainant operates its primary website at the domain name <jll.com>, which is owned by the JLL group.

The Domain Name was registered on February 28, 2025, and at the time of filing of the Complaint, resolved to a Registrar parked page.

#### **5. Parties’ Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

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

Complainant contends that (i) the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant’s trademarks; (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

In particular, Complainant contends that it has trademark registrations for JLL, and that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name with the intention to confuse Internet users looking for bona fide and well-known JLL products and services.

Complainant notes that it has no affiliation with Respondent, that Respondent is using the Domain Name to trade off the Complainant’s rights reputation, and that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the registration and use of the Domain Name. Further, Complainant contends that Respondent has acted in bad faith in acquiring and setting up the Domain Name, when Respondent clearly knew of Complainant’s rights. Complainant claims the passively holding of the Domain Name constitutes a factor in finding bad faith registration and use pursuant to Policy.

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

Respondent did not reply to Complainant’s contentions.

## 6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ([“WIPO Overview 3.0”](#)) states that failure to respond to the complainant’s contentions would not by itself mean that the complainant is deemed to have prevailed; a respondent’s default is not necessarily an admission that the complainant’s claims are true.

### A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Ownership of a trademark registration is generally sufficient evidence that a complainant has the requisite rights in a mark for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. Complainant has provided evidence of its rights in the JLL trademarks, as noted above under section 4. Complainant has also submitted evidence which supports that the JLL trademarks are widely known and a distinctive identifier of Complainant’s products and services.

Complainant has therefore proven that it has the requisite rights in the JLL trademarks.

With Complainant’s rights in the JLL trademarks established, the remaining question under the first element of the Policy is whether the Domain Name, typically disregarding the Top-Level Domain (“TLD”) in which it is registered (in this case is, “.com”), is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant’s trademark. See, e.g., *B & H Foto & Electronics Corp. v. Domains by Proxy, Inc. / Joseph Gross*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-0842](#).

Here, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant’s JLL trademarks. The JLL trademarks are recognizable in the Domain Name. In particular, the Domain Name’s inclusion of Complainant’s JLL trademarks in their entirety, with an addition of the term “usa” in the Domain Name <usajll.com>, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the JLL trademarks. See section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

Thus, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied the first element of the Policy.

### B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, a complainant must make a prima facie showing that a respondent possesses no rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. See, e.g., *Malayan Banking Berhad v. Beauty, Success & Truth International*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-1393](#). Once a complainant makes out such a prima facie showing, the burden of production shifts to the respondent, though the burden of proof always remains on the complainant. If the respondent fails to come forward with relevant evidence showing rights or legitimate interests, the complainant will have sustained its burden under the second element of the UDRP. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

From the record in this case, it is evident that Respondent was, and is, aware of Complainant and its JLL trademarks, and does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. In addition, Complainant asserts that Respondent has not been authorized to register domain names incorporating its trademarks and is not related to Complainant. Respondent is also not known to be associated with the JLL trademarks and there is no evidence showing that Respondent has been commonly known by the Domain Name. Further, the nature of the Domain Name comprising Complainant’s trademarks in their entirety, with the inclusion of the geographical term “usa” indicates an awareness of Complainant, as Respondent is based in the United States.

In addition, Respondent has not used the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Rather, at the time of filing of the Complaint, the Domain Name resolved to an inactive website. At the time of the Decision, the Domain Name still resolved to a parked website. Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use and does not, in the given circumstances, confer on Respondent any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. See, e.g. *Intesa Sanpaolo S.p.A. v. Charles Duke / Oneandone Private Registration*, WIPO Case No. [D2013-0875](#).

Accordingly, Complainant has provided evidence supporting its prima facie claim that Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Respondent has failed to produce countervailing evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Thus, the Panel concludes that Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name and Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Panel finds that Respondent's actions indicate that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances indicating bad faith registration and use on the part of a domain name registrant, namely:

“(i) circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) you have registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product or service on your website or location.”

The Panel finds that Complainant has provided ample evidence to show that registration and use of the JLL trademarks long predate the registration of the Domain Name. Complainant's group is also well established and known. Indeed, the record shows that Complainant's JLL trademarks and related products and services are widely known and recognized. Therefore, Respondent was likely aware of the JLL trademarks when it registered the Domain Name, and knew, or should have known, that the Domain Name was confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2; see also *TTT Moneycorp Limited v. Privacy Gods / Privacy Gods Limited*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-1973](#).

In particular, the registration of the Domain Name incorporating Complainant's JLL trademark in its entirety together with the geographical term “usa” suggests Respondent's actual knowledge of Complainant's rights in the JLL trademarks at the time of registration of the Domain Name and its effort to opportunistically capitalize on the registration and use of the Domain Name. Further, UDRP panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly a domain name comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. See section 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

The Panel therefore finds that Respondent's awareness of Complainant's trademark rights at the time of registration suggests bad faith. See *Red Bull GmbH v. Credit du Léman SA, Jean-Denis Deletraz*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-2209](#); *Nintendo of America Inc v. Marco Beijen, Beijen Consulting, Pokemon Fan Clubs Org., and Pokemon Fans Unite*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-1070](#); and *BellSouth Intellectual Property Corporation v. Serena, Axel*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0007](#).

At the time of the Decision, the Domain Name resolved to a parked page. Such use does not prevent a finding of bad faith, under the doctrine of passive holding. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

In the present circumstances, considering the distinctiveness and reputation of the JLL trademarks, and the failure of Respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use, the Panel finds that Respondent has registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith and Complainant succeeds under the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 <usajll.com> be transferred to Complainant.

*/Kimberley Chen Nobles/*

**Kimberley Chen Nobles**

Sole Panelist

Date: August 1, 2025