

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Taylor Wessing Limited Liability Partnership v. Mary Little
Case No. D2025-3210

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Taylor Wessing Limited Liability Partnership, United Kingdom, internally represented.

The Respondent is Mary Little, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <taylorwessing-law.com> 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 August 11, 2025. On August 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 13, 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 (DOMAIN ADMIN) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 13, 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 August 14, 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 7, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 9, 2025.

The Center appointed Rodrigo Velasco Santelices as the sole panelist in this matter on September 16, 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, Taylor Wessing LLP, is a major law firm operating as part of a global network of affiliated firms across 17 jurisdictions worldwide, employing over 1,200 lawyers. Each Taylor Wessing firm across the world is a member of, or affiliated to a member of, the Taylor Wessing group structure, and therefore affiliated with the Complainant.

The origins of the firm and its name span three centuries, with its current form arising from the merger of Taylor Joynson Garrett and Wessing & Berenberg-Gossler in 2002. Therefore, the Complainant has been providing its services under the name TAYLOR WESSING for over 20 years.

In order to protect its brand, the Complainant has registered a number of trademarks for TAYLOR WESSING, including United Kingdom trademark registration number UK00902727519 registered on March 31, 2004, European Union trademark registration number 002727519 registered on March 31, 2004, and United States trademark registration number 2941089 registered on April 19, 2005. These trademarks are all registered for services including business management and legal services in classes 35, 36 and 42 (among others).

The Complainant has also established a significant online presence through its flagship domain name <taylorwessing.com>, operating its global website at “www.taylorwessing.com” and using this domain name for all corporate email addresses.

The firm's success had global revenues for 2024/25 exceeding GBP 500 million, as well as consistent recognition within the legal industry over many years, including prestigious legal directories such as Chambers Global, Legal 500 UK, and Legal 500 Deutschland. Taylor Wessing was recognized in The Times' list of Best Law Firms 2024 for the sixth consecutive year since the awards began, as well as the Chambers High Net Worth Guide 2024. Other recent accolades include winning the Client Choice Award for Product Liability Defense (2024), Legal Business Award for Life Sciences Team of the Year (2024), Managing IP EMEA Awards for Impact Case of the Year (2023), Tolley's Taxation Awards for Best Corporate or Business Tax Practice (2023), and being shortlisted for British Legal Awards Property Team of the Year (2022), and FT Innovative Lawyer Awards for designing the client experience (2022).

The domain name was registered on July 21, 2025; many years after the establishment of the Complainant's well-known TAYLOR WESSING mark.

The Complainant has provided evidence showing that it has been reported to it that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in a fraudulent email scam (the “Scam”). The Scam involved a fraudulent WhatsApp message purporting to be from a CEO of an investment bank and financial services company, which attempted to elicit money (a “good faith deposit”) and referred the recipient to an email address “[...]@taylorwessing-law.com”. The Respondent used that email address to masquerade as a partner of the Complainant's firm.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name redirects to the Complainant's genuine website at “www.taylorwessing.com”.

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 he is the owner of the registered trademark TAYLOR WESSING so it cannot be questioned that the disputed domain name <taylorwessing-law.com> is confusingly similar to that trademark registration. The disputed domain name reproduces the TAYLOR WESSING trademark in its entirety. It is identical to the TAYLOR WESSING name, save for the descriptive word "law" added at the end. Given that the Complainant provides legal services, the use of the identifier "law" in the disputed domain name creates an even stronger connection with the Complainant. The disputed domain name is therefore highly and confusingly similar to the TAYLOR WESSING trademark.

The Complainant states that the Respondent has no right or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. To the Complainant's knowledge, the Respondent has never been commonly known by the disputed domain name and has never acquired any trademark rights in the disputed domain name.

Finally, the Complainant claims that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

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 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 mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the trademark 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 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 Complainant confirmed that neither the Complainant nor its partner have any connection with the Respondent, the disputed domain name, or the email sent with an email address associated with the disputed domain name. The Complainant also confirmed that it had not, until it was made aware of the scam, heard of such email address. In these circumstances it is obvious that the disputed domain name was used for fraudulent purposes to confuse the third parties into believing the Respondent is associated with the Complainant in a fraudulent attempt to defraud the third parties into transferring funds for the benefit of the Respondent.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant's marks were registered many years prior to the registration of the disputed domain name. And the mark TAYLOR WESSING is well known internationally.

Noting also the use of the disputed domain name in furtherance of a fraudulent email scheme impersonating the Complainant, the Respondent knew or should have known the Complainant's trademark when registering the disputed domain name on July 21, 2025. That fact cannot be a simple coincidence. Further, the use of the term "law" in the domain name affirms the Respondent's intention of targeting the Complainant, a famous law firm.

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 illegitimate or illegal activity, here claimed phishing, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. 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 <taylorwessing-law.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Rodrigo Velasco Santelices/

Rodrigo Velasco Santelices

Sole Panelist

Date: September 30, 2025