

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

BGC Group, Inc., BGC Partners L.P., BGC Brokers L.P v. Name redacted,
Bradwell Grove, bradwell.grove.bgc.

Case No. D2025-3536

1. The Parties

The Complainants are BGC Group, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), BGC Partners L.P., United States, and BGC Brokers L.P., United Kingdom (individually and collectively referred to as “Complainant”), represented by Akerman LLP, United States.

The Respondents are Name redacted¹, and Bradwell Grove, bradwell.grove.bgc, Republic of Moldova.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <bgc-brokers-lp.org> and <bgcbrokers-lp.org> are registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com and Atak Domain Hosting Internet ve Bilgi Teknolojileri Limited Sirketi d/b/a Atak Teknoloji respectively (the “Registrars”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 2, 2025. On September 2, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On September 3, 2025 and September 17, 2028, the Registrars 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 / BRADWELL.GROVE.BGC,).

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 18, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints for the disputed domain names associated with different

¹ The Respondent appears to have used the name of a third-party organization when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent’s organization 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 organization. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in these proceedings, and has indicated Annex 1 to this Decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case.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](#).

underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on September 19, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 19, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 9, 2025. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 10, 2025.

The Center appointed Manuel Moreno-Torres as the sole panelist in this matter on October 15, 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 operates in the field of global brokerage and financial technology.

The Complainant holds a portfolio of trademark for BGC in different jurisdictions. By way of example, before the United States Patent and Trademark Office with registration number 3184410 registered on December 12, 2006 or registration number 4001347 registered on July 26, 2011.

Likewise, the Complainant is the owner of the mark BGC BROKERAGE before the European Union Intellectual Property Office with registration number 003812195 and registered on July 20, 2005.

The complainant's official website is at the domain name <bgcg.com>

The disputed domain name <bgc-brokers-lp.org> was registered on August 5, 2025 and redirects to a website purporting to be one of Complainant's affiliate offering an alleged trading platform for investors.

The disputed domain name <bgcbrokers-lp.org> was registered on June 12, 2024 and redirects via a subdomain, e.g. <user.bgcbrokers-lp.org/login> to a login page for "www.bgc-brokers-lp.org".

The Parties have been involved in a previous case, *BGC Group, Inc., BGC Partners, L.P., BGC Brokers L.P. v. Bradwell Grove, bradwell.grove.bgc*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2069](#) taking the parties the same position and where the panelist agreed to transfer the disputed domain names to the Complainant.

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 the disputed domain names incorporate Complainant's BGC trademark in its entirety and the mere addition of the word "brokers" and the abbreviation "lp" (that is to say "limited partnership") do not diminish the confusing similarity.

With regard to the second element, the Complainant says that none of the circumstances depicted in paragraph 4 (c) of the Policy applies in this case. Further, the Complainant alleges that the information for Respondents appear to be bogus since it is using one of Complainant's affiliates company name on its website and other related materials. Therefore, the Respondents are attempting to impersonate the Complainant to direct web users to its own website to promote a purported trading platform which is nothing more than a front of defraud unsuspecting consumers.

The Complainant alleges that Respondent's disputed domain names were registered long after Complainant's rights in its BGC well-known trademark were established. Indeed, the registration of the disputed domain name <bgc-brokers-lp.org> took place few days after losing a previous UDRP proceeding in connection to BGC trademark (referred above).

The Respondents have targeted the Complainant and its BGC trademark because the disputed domain names divert Internet users to an alleged online financial trading services purporting to be the Complainant by using the mark and one of Complainant's company name. The Complainant also notes that the website to which the domain name <bgc-brokers-lp.org> diverts is the same website and uses the same address in London as in WIPO Case No. [D2025-2069](#) ut supra. The Complainant submits an example of an email received by the Complainant regarding the fraudulent scheme developed by the Respondent in this previous dispute.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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

- (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

There are no exceptional circumstances within paragraph 5(f) of the Rules to prevent the Panel from determining the dispute based upon the Complaint, notwithstanding the failure of the Respondents to file a Response. Under paragraph 14(a) of the Rules in the event of such a "default" the Panel is still required "to proceed with a decision on the complaint", whilst under paragraph 14(b) it "shall draw such inferences therefrom as it considers appropriate". This dispute resolution procedure is accepted by the domain name registrant as a condition of registration.

A. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. Indeed, <bgc-brokers-lp.org> domain name is registered by a Complainant's affiliate which is simply an impersonation. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that both disputed domain name whois details use identical email address and both websites to which the disputed domain names redirect are linked and "Bradwell grove" appears in both records. While the disputed domain name <bgc-brokers-lp.org> divert to a site purporting to be the Complainant, the disputed domain name <bgcbrokers-lp.org> redirects, via subdomain, to a login access page for the latter. Moreover, the registrant information of the first disputed domain name is fake, and the Panel considers that an impersonation occurs in this case.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

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 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, "brokers" or the two letters "lp" that seems to be an acronym may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term or acronym do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the mark 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 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.

While the Policy in paragraph 4 (c) take into consideration the 3 illustrative examples of Respondent rights, the Complainant has evidenced that none is met in this case.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed as applicable to this case: impersonation/passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1. Indeed, the Respondent performed a number of acts that evidence impersonation. As such, the composition of the disputed domain names coupled with the reproduction of one of the Complainant's affiliate company name and its trademarks in Respondent's website purporting to be the Complainant. To this, the Panel must add that parties are engaged in the same field of business which increases the circumstances that lead to an unfair confusion. Under these circumstances the Panel finds no right or legitimate interest for 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 Respondent falls in the circumstances set out in paragraph 4(b) (iv) of the Policy: intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark. That is to say, the disputed domain names bait the Internet users into a website which they might think is an official site of the Complainant when this is not the case.

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.

The Panel finds evident that the Respondent knew the Complainant and its trademarks when registering the disputed domain name <bgc-brokers-lp.org> only days after losing an UDRP case related to the same Complainant and trademarks. And on balance, the Respondent knew about the Complainant and its trademarks when registering the disputed domain name <bgcbrokers-lp.org> due to their reputation and distinctiveness in the field of brokerage and financial technology. Besides, the Complainant's marks and/or one of its affiliate company names are reproduced in the Respondent's website simply because he tried to take advantage of the goodwill and attractiveness of BCG trademark. Thus, the Respondent targeted the Complainant and its trademarks, and the registration was in bad faith.

The Panel also notes the absence of rights and legitimate interests of the Respondent, as well as the introduction of inaccurate data in the registration details for the disputed domain name <bgc-brokers-lp.org> (by impersonating a Complainant's affiliate as registrant or by providing contradictory city post details in the registration process), which together would support the conclusion of bad faith registration and use by the Respondent.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed as applicable to this case: impersonation/passing off constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. The Panel finds that such action may cause an Internet user to give personal details to open a web account which that person would not otherwise do if he knew that the Respondent and not the Complainant was in charge of it. Accordingly,

the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names 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 names <bgc-brokers-lp.org> and <bgcbrokers-lp.org> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Manuel Moreno-Torres/

Manuel Moreno-Torres

Sole Panelist

Date: October 29, 2025