

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lennar Pacific Properties Management, LLC, Lennar Corporation v. Jamie Douglas
Case No. D2025-4104

1. The Parties

Complainants are Lennar Pacific Properties Management, LLC and Lennar Corporation, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Slates Harwell Campbell, LLP, United States.

Respondent is Jamie Douglas, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lennarco.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 7, 2025. On October 8, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 9, 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 (Redacted, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainants on October 14, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainants filed amendments to the Complaint on October 16 and 22, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendments 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").

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 3, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 23, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on November 24, 2025.

The Center appointed Michael A. Albert as the sole panelist in this matter on December 1, 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 Lennar Pacific Properties Management, LLC is the owner/licensor and Lennar Corporation is the licensee of the following United States federal-registered marks:

Mark	Registration No.	Registration Date
LENNAR	U.S. Registration No. 3,108,401	June 27, 2006
LENNAR	U.S. Registration No. 3,477,143	July 29, 2008

Lennar Corporation has been one of the leading homebuilders in the United States since 1954. Lennar Corporation develops, builds, and sells homes in twenty-one states in the United States. Complainants have offered real estate management, brokerage, development, construction, mortgage, and financial services under the LENNAR marks since at least as early as 1973. In connection with these services, Lennar Corporation owns and operates a website utilizing the LENNAR marks, located at the domain name <lennar.com>. In addition, Complainants also use <lennar.com> to conduct email correspondence for their businesses.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 2, 2025.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainants

Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, Complainants contend that the disputed domain name is a virtually confusingly similar "typosquatting" variant of the LENNAR mark in its entirety, with the mere addition of the descriptive letters "co" after the word Lennar which signifies "company" and thus fails to distinguish the domain name from the LENNAR marks.

Complainants further contend that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name. Specifically, upon investigation, information, and belief, Complainants have not located any evidence of Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name or any variant thereof in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith by Respondent. Specifically, Respondent has used the disputed domain name to impersonate a Lennar employee. That fact, taken together with the distinctiveness and reputation of the LENNAR marks and Respondent's concealing of its identity or use of false contact information supports a finding that Respondent has acted in bad faith.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainants' 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 Complainants' trademarks and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

Given their United States federal trademark registrations, Complainants have shown rights in respect of the LENNAR 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 mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. Although the addition of the letters "co" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such letters 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 Complainants have established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted Complainants' prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence (or indeed any response at all) demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Moreover, given that "co" is a common abbreviation for "company", the addition of this term in the disputed domain name increases likelihood of Internet user of confusion, as consumers may believe the disputed domain name is affiliated with Complainants' companies.

Panels have, furthermore, held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed impersonation/passing off as an employee of Complainants for fraud and commercial gain can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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 finds that Complainants provided evidence that Respondent has used the disputed domain name to impersonate an employee of Complainants so as to attempt to cause a third party to fraudulently redirect funds and/or materials and parts from one of Complainants' vendors. Use of the disputed domain name as part of a fraudulent scheme, including impersonation of an employee, is quintessential bad faith. Panels have repeatedly held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity as claimed by Complainants 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 Complainants have 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 <lennarco.com> be transferred to Complainants.

/Michael A. Albert/

Michael A. Albert

Sole Panelist

Date: December 15, 2025