

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP v. Cecily Ran Deng, paulwelss  
Case No. D2025-3970

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison LLP, United States of America, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Cecily Ran Deng, paulwelss, United States of America.

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

The Disputed Domain Name <paulwelss.com> 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 29, 2025. On September 29, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 30, 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 0176015455) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 1, 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 October 1, 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 October 6, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 26, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 27, 2025.

The Center appointed Colin T. O'Brien as the sole panelist in this matter on November 3, 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 law firm of more than 1,000 lawyers with 10 offices in the United States, Europe, Asia and Canada. Complainant represents many of the world's largest and most important public and private corporations, asset managers and financial institutions, as well as clients in need of pro bono assistance.

Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registrations:

- PAUL WEISS United States Registration Number 2521609, registered on December 25, 2001;
- PAUL WEISS United Kingdom Registration Number 801530423, registered on October 01, 2020 and
- PAUL WEISS International Registration No. 1530423, registered on February 24, 2020.

Complaint, together with its predecessor firms, has been a presence in New York City for 150 years and a part of the international legal community for more than fifty years.

Complainant's PAUL WEISS brand and services maintain a strong online presence on the website found at "paulweiss.com". According to Similarweb.com, had a total visit of 132,213 in August 2025, ranking it as the 86,309th most popular website in the United States.

Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name on August 26, 2025

#### **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 by virtue of its trademark registrations Complainant is the owner of PAUL WEISS trademark. The second level portion of the disputed domain name is a purposeful misspelling of Complainant's "PAUL WEISS" trademark and must be considered confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark. More specifically the disputed domain name varies from Complainant's trademark by only one letter –Respondent has replaced the letter "I" to "I".

As the Disputed Domain Name differs from the Complainant's trademark by just one letter, the Respondent's domain must be considered a prototypical example of typosquatting – which intentionally takes advantage of internet users that inadvertently type an incorrect address – often a misspelling of the complainant's trademark – when seeking to access the trademark owner's website. This means that a deliberate misspelling of a trademark registered as a domain name, which is intended to confuse internet users, must be confusingly similar by design.

Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with Complainant in any way, nor has Complainant given Respondent license, authorization or permission to use Complainant's trademark in any manner, including in domain names. Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, which evinces a lack of rights or legitimate interests.

Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name on August 26, 2025, which is significantly after the registration of Complainant's PAUL WEISS trademark with the USPTO, UKIPO and WIPO. The Disputed Domain Name's registration date is also significantly after the registration of the domain name, and Complainant's first use in commerce of the PAUL WEISS trademark.

Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Name to send Fraudulent e-mails which had the appearance of coming from one of the Complainant's associates. Respondent sent and attached a supposed updated payoff letter for one of Complainant's clients' existing term loan. Thus, by sending emails from the Disputed Domain Name, Respondent attempted to impersonate Complainant as part of a fraudulent email phishing scheme. Such use of the Disputed Domain Name cannot be considered as bona fide offering of goods or services, or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

By registering a domain name that incorporates a misspelling of Complainant's "PAUL WEISS" trademark, Respondent has created a domain name that is confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark, and its domain name. As such, Respondent has demonstrated a knowledge of and familiarity with Complainant's brand and business. In addition, by using the Disputed Domain Name to send Fraudulent emails, it is "not possible to conceive of a plausible situation in which the Respondent would have been unaware of" the Complainant's brand at the time the Disputed Domain Name was registered. Respondent registered and used the Disputed Domain Name as part of a Fraudulent email phishing scheme, which is clear evidence of bad faith registration and use.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

The Complainant has demonstrated it owns registered trademark rights in the PAUL WEISS mark. The disputed domain name differs from the Complainant's PAUL WEISS mark by replacing the letter "i" with the letter "l" which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the mark and the disputed domain name. See section 1.9 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)").

Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the mark in which the Complainant has rights.

### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

The Complainant has presented a *prima facie* case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name. The fact that the Respondent obtained the disputed domain name which is a typo of the Complainant's primary domain name <paulweiss.com> indicates that the Respondent likely sought to piggyback on the Complainant's mark for illegitimate reasons.

After a complainant has made a *prima facie* case, the burden of production shifts to a respondent to present evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. See, e.g., *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0455](#).

Here, the Respondent has provided no evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. In the absence of any evidence rebutting the Complainant's *prima facie* case indicating the Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

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

The disputed domain name was registered years after the Complainant first used and registered its PAUL WEISS mark. The evidence provided by the Complainant makes it clear that the Respondent undoubtedly knew of the Complainant's "PAUL WEISS" mark and knew that it had no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name when it was registered.

There is no apparent benign reason for the Respondent to have registered the disputed domain name that is a typo variant of the Complainant's mark.

Further, the use of the disputed domain name by Respondent is in bad faith. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) states that evidence of bad faith may include a respondent's use of a domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain. The Complainant has alleged that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to send fraudulent emails to its client impersonating employees of the Complainant in an attempt to phish funds from the Complainant's client. The fact that the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website is immaterial as the disputed domain name was used for email purposes and as ammunition to attack the Complaint and its clients, is clearly indicative of bad faith use on the part of Respondent. In sum, there is a clear implausibility of the possibility of Respondent's good faith use of the disputed domain name. In the totality of circumstances, the Panel finds bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

### **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 <paulwelss.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Colin T. O'Brien/*

**Colin T. O'Brien**

Sole Panelist

Date: November 11, 2025