

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Southern Land Company, LLC v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2025-3552

1. The Parties

Complainant is Southern Land Company, LLC, United States of America (hereinafter “United States”), represented by CM Law PLLC, United States.

Respondent is Name Redacted¹.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <southernlandcompanyllc.com> (hereinafter the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 2, 2025. On September 3, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On September 3, 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 (Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0175305867) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on September 5, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on September 5, 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”).

¹ The Respondent appears to have used the name and/or contact details 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Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in these proceedings, and has indicated Annex 1 to this Decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case.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](#).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 9, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 29, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on September 30, 2025. An informal communication was sent by Respondent to the Center on October 1, 2025.

The Center appointed Lawrence K. Nodine as the sole panelist in this matter on October 13, 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 real estate company that develops master-planned, single-family, multifamily, mixed-use, and hospitality projects with a current project pipeline valued at USD 4 billion. Complainant has been using the SOUTHERN LAND trademark (hereinafter the "Mark") since at least as early as 1986. Complainant owns United States trademark registration for the Mark Registration No. 2,961,726 (registered June 14, 2005).

Complainant owns the domain name <southernland.com>, where it publishes information and advertising about its business.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on June 22, 2025. It does not resolve to an active website. Mail Exchange (MX) servers have been set, thereby enabling email functionality. Google has flagged the Disputed Domain Name as unsafe.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

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

B. Respondent

Respondent did not submit a timely response to the Complaint. However, on October 1, 2025, Respondent sent an email (apparently in response to the Notification of Default) to the Center stating: "What is this ? I own nothing with any domain ?"

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 1.2.1.

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

Although the addition of other terms may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of "companyllc" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name 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 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. 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 the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name was registered in bad faith. Respondent’s email (from the email address identified by the Registrar as the Registrant’s email address) states “What is this ? I own nothing with any domain ?” Based on this, the Panel infers that an unknown third party likely registered the Disputed Domain Name in Respondent’s name without authority. This is bad faith registration, [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1 (bad faith registration inferred from false contact information and failure to respond) and bad faith use. *Id.*, section 3.3 (passive holding finding based on false contact information). The Panel infers an intention to target Complainant from the addition of “company” and “llc” to the Mark, which renders the Disputed Domain Name identical to the Complainant’s corporate name and, on the balance of probabilities and in the absence of any substantive response putting forward a legitimate non-infringing purpose, reveals an intent to target a specific entity rather than exploit any descriptive connotations (this is true even though the term “land” is disclaimed in the Mark).

The Panel finds that 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 <southernlandcompanyllc.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Lawrence K. Nodine/

Lawrence K. Nodine

Sole Panelist

Date: October 27, 2025.