

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

N. M. Rothschild & Sons Limited v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2025-2835

1. The Parties

The Complainant is N. M. Rothschild & Sons Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Name Redacted¹.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <rothschildandco.site> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 17, 2025. On July 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 21, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 21, 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 an amended Complaint on July 23, 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”).

¹ The Respondent appears to have used the name and postal address of a third party when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent’s name from this decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding, and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 13, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 14, 2025. The Center received a third party email communication on August 14, 2025, acknowledging its receipt of the Written Notice and indicating there is no one registered at the third party's address has ever registered the disputed domain name.

The Center appointed Gill Mansfield as the sole panelist in this matter on August 25, 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 company incorporated in England and Wales. The Complainant has been one of the leading providers of financial services for over 200 years and it provides mergers and acquisitions ("M&A"), strategy and financing advice, as well as investment and wealth management solutions to large institutions, families, individuals and governments. It provides services worldwide under the brands ROTHSCHILD and ROTHSCHILD & CO.

The Complainant, and its affiliated entities, have various trademark registrations for ROTHSCHILD and ROTHSCHILD & CO dating back to 1982 including (inter alia):

- United Kingdom trademark registration number UK00001168291 for ROTHSCHILD (word mark) registered on January 21, 1982 in class 14.
- European Union trademark registration number 000206458 for ROTHSCHILD (word mark) registered on October 8, 1998, in classes 14, 35, and 36.
- United States of America trademark registration number 5614371 for ROTHSCHILD & CO (word mark) registered on November 27, 2018 in classes 35 and 36.

Rothschild & Co Continuation Holdings AG, an entity affiliated with the Complainant, is the registrant of the domain name <rothschildandco.com> from which the group's official website operates.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 26, 2025. At the time of the Complaint, the disputed domain name did not resolve to an active website. This was the result of a request by the Complainant that the Registrar take down the website associated with the disputed domain name due to the risk of fraud. Prior to this request, the disputed domain name resolved to a website that was an almost identical copy of the Complainant's own website.

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 name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. It states the disputed domain name incorporates the ROTHSCHILD trademark in its entirety and incorporates the ROTHSCHILD & CO trademark in its entirety except for the replacement of the ampersand symbol "&" with its literal meaning, "and". It argues that the substitution of the word "and" for the ampersand symbol "&" would not avoid confusing similarity with the Complainant's trademarks. It also

argues that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's own domain name <rothschildandco.com> as the two domain names are identical save for the replacement of the ".com" with the ".site". It contends that there is a real risk that Internet users will believe that there is a connection between the disputed domain name and the Complainant.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. It states the trademarks are not descriptive terms, and that there is no relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant. The Complainant has not licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the "Rothschild" name, the ROTHSCHILD & CO or the ROTHSCHILD trademarks, or to register a domain name incorporating any of them. So far as the Complainant is aware, the Respondent is not a customer of the Complainant (or *vice versa*). Further, the Complainant has not found any evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. It submits that the Respondent is not making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services. It states that as of July 10, 2025 the disputed domain name did not lead to an active website. It also submits that the disputed domain name falsely suggests an affiliation with the Complainant and that as the disputed domain name contains the marks in their entirety there is a higher risk of implied affiliation.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. It argues that the disputed domain name was registered in an attempt to intentionally mislead Internet users into associating the disputed domain name with the Complainant's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks. It submits that the trademarks are well known in connection with the Complainant and that there is substantial goodwill and reputation in the trademarks. It further submits that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's rights at the time that it registered the disputed domain name. It argues that that Internet users are likely to be misled into believing that the disputed domain name is affiliated to, endorsed by, or otherwise connected to the Complainant, and that recipients of an email from the disputed domain name are likely to believe these have been sent by the Complainant. It asserts that the similarity of the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademarks also leads to a heightened risk that the disputed domain name could be used for phishing or other fraudulent purposes.

The Complainant also states that the dispute domain name previously resolved to a website that was almost identical to the Complainant's website, using the Complainant's ROTHSCHILD & CO logo, and with content (including text and images) that was identical to the Complainant's website. It points to the fact that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name using a false name and false address, the nature of which provides clear evidence of knowledge of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration, and submits that this is a further indicator of bad faith.

B. Respondent

Except for the above-mentioned email communication from a third party under section 3. above, the Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy the Complainant carries the burden of proving:

- (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights, and
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, and
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[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 entirety of the ROTHSCHILD mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name with the addition of the term "andco". The ROTHSCHILD & CO trademark is also recognizable within the disputed domain name with the only difference being the use of the long form of the word "and" instead of the ampersand symbol "&". Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The applicable Top-Level Domain ("TLD") in a domain name is a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1. As such, the TLD ".site" in the disputed domain name is disregarded for the purposes of the first element confusing similarity test.

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 name. 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 name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel finds that there is no relationship between the Respondent and the Complainant. The Complainant has not licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the Complainant's name or trademarks, or to register any domain name containing them. There is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. There is also no evidence of use or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services, or legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names.

The disputed domain name comprises the Complainant's well-known ROTHSCCHILD mark with the addition of the term "andco" and the well-known ROTHSCCHILD & CO mark with only the substitution of the ampersand sign "&" for its literal equivalent "and". In addition, the disputed domain name mimics the Complainant's own legitimate domain name <rothschildandco.com> with only the TLD differing. The Panel notes that the use of the TLD ".site" in the disputed domain name is descriptive of or denotes a website. Collectively, this falsely creates the impression that the disputed domain name is that of the Complainant, or is related to, linked to or affiliated with the Complainant.

Further, the record shows that the disputed domain name previously resolved to an active copycat website that prominently displayed the Complainant's ROTHSCCHILD & CO trademark and logo, mimicked the layout and design of the Complainant's website, and used images and text featured on the Complainant's own website. The Panel finds that this was a copycat website which sought to impersonate the Complainant's legitimate website.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity such as impersonation / passing off, or other types of fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to impersonate the website of the Complainant and to pass itself off as the Complainant can never confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent.

Further, according to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw from the lack of response of the Respondent such inferences as it considers appropriate. The Panel is of the view that the lack of response from the Respondent corroborates the absence of any rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain name.

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.

Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names 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 on bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

In the present case, the Panel notes the Complainant's long history and that the disputed domain name was registered 43 years after the Complainant's registration of the ROTHSCCHILD trademark. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainant's marks have achieved significant goodwill and reputation and are well known worldwide. In view of the worldwide reputation in the Complainant's trademarks it is inconceivable that the Respondent did not have knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks at the time the disputed domain name was registered.

Moreover, the Respondent's conduct demonstrates the Respondent's knowledge and active targeting of the Complainant's brand and trademarks. As noted above, the available record shows that the disputed domain name previously resolved to a copycat site that used the logos, photography, design, layout, text and registered trademark of the Complainant, thereby impersonating the Complainant's legitimate website. The copycat website also contained a WhatsApp contact button that purported to allow for contact with the "Rothschild President". In the circumstances of this case, the Panel is prepared to infer the likelihood of fraudulent activity on the part of the Respondent.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the Respondent's website or products or services on the Respondent's website under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Further, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal or illegitimate activity (such as, in this case, impersonation/passing off and other fraudulent activity) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

Finally, the Panel notes the use of a third party's name and address by the Respondent when registering the disputed domain name as a further indicator of bad faith.

The current non-use of the disputed domain name, under the circumstances of this case, does not change the Panel's finding on the Respondent's bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 name <rothschildandco.site> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gill Mansfield/

Gill Mansfield

Sole Panelist

Date: September 8, 2025