

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

The Glenmede Trust Company, N.A. v. znup .RUE  
Case No. D2025-3972

### **1. The Parties**

Complainant is The Glenmede Trust Company, N.A., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Cozen O'Connor, United States.

Respondent is znup .RUE, United States.

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

The disputed domain name <glenmedelimited.com> is registered with Squarespace Domains LLC (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 29, 2025. On September 30, 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 (Unknown Registrant) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on October 3, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on October 6, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on October 7, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 27, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on October 30, 2025.

The Center appointed Frederick M. Abbott as the sole panelist in this matter on November 4, 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 privately-owned wealth management advisory firm incorporated in the State of Pennsylvania, United States.<sup>1</sup> It serves three principal client segments: individuals and families, endowments and foundations, and institutional investors. As of the close of 2024, Complainant had approximately USD 49 billion under management, with nine offices in the United States, and doing business throughout the United States. Complainant was founded in 1956. Complainant maintains an active commercial website at “www.glenmede.com”.

Complainant is the owner of registration for the word trademark GLENMEDE on the Principal Register of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), registration number 2,199,741, registration dated October 27, 1998, in international classes (ICs) 35 and 36, covering, inter alia, data processing in the field of financial management (as further specified), and banking and financial planning services (as further specified). Complainant asserts that in addition to rights based on registration at the USPTO, it has acquired common law trademark rights in GLENMEDE through advertising and promotion in connection with its services.

According to the Registrar’s verification, Respondent is registrant of the disputed domain name. According to the Whois report the disputed domain name was registered on July 7, 2025.

Respondent has used the disputed domain name to direct Internet users to a website identified by the term “glenmede limited”. The website is in the Spanish language, referring to initial clients from the 1960s such as the family founders of Coca-Cola, and broadening its portfolio to family offices, foundations and institutions.<sup>2</sup> Respondent’s website lists an address in New York City, and a telephone number with a Spain country code. Complainant asserts that several third-party consumers have reported to it that Respondent is using the “Glenmede Limited” website to solicit the deposit of funds, the withdrawal of which is then blocked by Respondent. According to Complainant, complaints concerning Respondent’s activities have been referred to law enforcement authorities.

There is no evidence on the record of these proceedings regarding any association, commercial or otherwise, between Complainant and Respondent.

#### **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.

Notably, Complainant contends that it owns rights in the trademark GLENMEDE and that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to that trademark.

---

<sup>1</sup> Complainant has identified itself as “The Glenmede Trust Company, N.A.”, while the listed owner of the trademark registration for GLENMEDE at the USPTO is “Glenmede Corporation, The”. A search of business records at the Pennsylvania Department of State website indicates that both entities are active and located at the same address in Pennsylvania, and it appears that the two are affiliated entities. Panel search of November 9, 2025. For purposes of this decision, the Panel attributes ownership of the trademark registration to the named Complainant by way of common control.

<sup>2</sup> Translation by the Panel.

Complainant argues that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because: (1) there is no evidence that Respondent has used the disputed domain name to undertake a bona fide offering of goods or services; (2) use of the disputed domain name for apparently illegal activities can never be the basis for rights or legitimate interests; (3) Respondent engaged a privacy or proxy service to register the disputed domain name; (4) Respondent has not been commonly known by Complainant's trademark, nor the disputed domain name; (5) Complainant has not authorized Respondent's use of its trademark in any manner, and; (6) Respondent has not made fair use of Complainant's trademark.

Complainant alleges that Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith because; (1) Respondent was targeting Complainant and its trademark when it registered the disputed domain name in light of Complainant's registered trademark and Respondent's use of that trademark on a website that included content regarding services similar to those of Complainant; (2) Respondent has used the website identified by the disputed domain name to fraudulently obtain funds from Internet users based on false association with Complainant; (3) Complainant's trademark is distinctive, supporting that Respondent deliberately targeted Complainant, and; (4) Respondent's use of a privacy service supports an inference of bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

The Center formally notified the Complaint to Respondent at the email and physical address provided in its record of registration. It appears that email transmission to Respondent was at least partly unsuccessful. Courier delivery to the physical address provided by Respondent in its record of registration was unsuccessful due to provision of false or incomplete contact details. The Center took those steps prescribed by the Policy and the Rules to provide notice to Respondent, and those steps are presumed to satisfy notice requirements.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy sets forth three elements that must be established by a complainant to merit a finding that a respondent has engaged in abusive domain name registration and use and to obtain relief. These elements are that:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which complainant has rights; and

(ii) respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(iii) 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 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.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of the GLENMEDE trademark for the purposes of the Policy.<sup>3</sup> [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> The Panel uses the term "trademark" in its inclusive sense to include both trademarks and service marks.

<sup>4</sup> Complainant has amply evidenced rights in its trademark through registration at the USPTO and related use. The Panel, without prejudice, need not address whether Complainant may also have unregistered rights in its trademark.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced 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, here “limited”, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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 Complainant, panels have recognized that proving 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 Respondent. As such, where Complainant, as here, makes out a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on Complainant). If Respondent, as here, fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, 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 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here claimed impersonation/passing off for purposes of fraudulently securing financial transfers from Internet users, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on Respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Respondent has failed to suggest any legitimate justification for its registration and use of the disputed domain name, and none is apparent on the face of its registration and use of the disputed domain name. Respondent appears to have targeted Complainant and its trademark to further Respondent’s pursuit of a scheme to defraud.

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 Respondent registered and used Complainant’s distinctive trademark long after Complainant secured registration of that trademark, and long after Complainant’s initial use of that trademark. Respondent on its website identified by the disputed domain name uses terminology substantially similar to that used by Complainant on its website to describe its offering of services. The Panel draws the reasonable inference that Respondent was aware of Complainant and its trademark when it registered the disputed domain name, and deliberately sought to take advantage of Complainant’s goodwill associated with its trademark.

Respondent used the disputed domain name to direct Internet users to a website identified by Complainant's distinctive trademark, along with a descriptive supplemental term, "limited". Respondent through that website solicited funds from Internet users using terminology similar to that used by Complainant in its business operations, including on Complainant's website. Respondent has not sought to refute Complainant's evidence that third parties transferred funds to Respondent under false pretenses, which funds they were not able to recover. Respondent has for commercial gain registered and used the disputed domain name to create Internet user confusion as to Complainant acting as the source, sponsor, affiliate or endorser of Respondent's website. Such registration and use by Respondent evidences bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here claimed impersonation/passing off for purposes of fraudulently securing financial transfers from Internet users, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

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

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 <glenmedelimited.com> be transferred to Complainant.

*/Frederick M. Abbott/*

**Frederick M. Abbott**

Sole Panelist

Date: November 14, 2025