

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Cantor Fitzgerald Securities v. z z
Case No. D2025-4502

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Cantor Fitzgerald Securities, United States of America (the “US”), represented by Akerman LLP, US.

The Respondent is z z, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <cantor-stock.com>, and <cantor-stock.online> (the “Disputed Domain Names”) are registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 31, 2025. On October 31, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Names. On November 3, 2025, the Registrar 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 FOR PRIVACY/SUPER PRIVACY, SERVICE LTD c/o DYNADOT) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 6, 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 November 10, 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 November 11, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 1, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on December 4, 2025.

The Center appointed Monica Novac as the sole panelist in this matter on December 24, 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 is a US company established more than 75 years ago, which offers global financial services, including, without limitation, broker-dealer, domestic and international equities, fixed income and currencies, real estate and investment banking services. The Complainant employs over 1,800 people serving more than 5,000 institutional clients in 35 locations around the globe.

The Complainant holds several trademark registrations for CANTOR in various jurisdictions, including the following:

- China Trademark Registration No. 6147038 CANTOR (word), registered on November 28, 2010, for services in class 36;
- US Trademark Registration No. 4930552 CANTOR (word), registered on April 5, 2016, for services in class 36; and
- US Trademark Registration No. 2682690 CANTOR (word), registered on February 4, 2003, for services in class 36.

The Complainant also owns the following domain names:

- <cantor.com>, registered on December 27, 1993, and used by the Complainant at least since the year 1998 in connection with a website regarding its financial services; and
- <cantorfitzgerald.com>, registered on September 7, 1999, and used in connection with the Complainant's website.

The Respondent is z z, reportedly located in Hong Kong, China. The Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Names on October 24, 2025. According to the information and evidence provided by the Complainant, the Disputed Domain Names used to resolve to some authentication/log in webpages, displaying also the Complainant's CANTOR trademark. At the date of rendering this Decision, when accessed by the Panel, the Disputed Domain Names resolve to inactive websites.

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 are confusingly similar to the Complainant's CANTOR trademark;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Names; and
- the Disputed Domain Names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's 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 the Complainant's trademark and the Disputed Domain Names. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[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 entirety of the CANTOR trademark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Names. The Panel finds that the CANTOR trademark is recognizable within the Disputed Domain Names. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Disputed Domain Names also contain the term "stock" preceded by a hyphen, however the Panel finds that the addition of this element does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Names and the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy. According to the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8, where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element.

According to the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1, the generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") ".com" and ".online" respectively, in the Disputed Domain Names are viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such are disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

Further to all the above, 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.

It is accepted by the Panel that there is no relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent and that the Complainant has not licensed nor authorized the Respondent to use the CANTOR trademark or to apply for the registration of the Disputed Domain Names. There is also no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the Disputed Domain Names.

The Disputed Domain Names contain the Complainant's CANTOR trademark which is followed by a hyphen and the descriptive term "stock". The Panel is of the opinion that the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Names with the ultimate intent to mislead the Internet users and to erroneously make them believe that the Disputed Domain Names are operated by or associated with the Complainant.

Although at the time of this Decision, the Disputed Domain Names resolve to inactive websites, as per the evidence filed by the Complainant, these used to resolve to some authentication/log in webpages unlawfully displaying the Complainant's CANTOR trademark. In this sense, it has been established that "respondent's use of a domain name will not be considered 'fair' if it falsely suggests affiliation with the trademark owner; the correlation between a domain name and the complainant's mark is often central to this inquiry". [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.

In view of the aforementioned, the Panel is of the opinion that the Respondent does not use the Disputed Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor does it make a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Names as per the Policy.

Further to all the above, 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.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant registered and used its CANTOR trademark long before the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Names. In view of the Complainant's international presence and widespread activity (including in Hong Kong, China, where the Respondent is reportedly located), as well the composition of the Disputed Domain Names, it is unlikely that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant's trademark and business when registering the Disputed Domain Names. The Panel considers that the Respondent targeted the Complainant when registering the Disputed Domain Names.

The Panel is of the opinion that the Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Names which contain the Complainant's CANTOR trademark followed by a hyphen, the descriptive term "stock" (which is commonly used in the financial sector, i.e., the same field where the Complainant carries out its business activity), and the gTLDs ".com", and ".online", signals an intention on the part of the Respondent to confuse users seeking or expecting the Complainant and it is a clear proof of the Respondent's bad faith.

Moreover, shortly before the commencement of this proceeding, the Disputed Domain Names resolved to some authentication/log in webpages unlawfully displaying the Complainant's CANTOR trademark, without any notable disclaimer; this further indicates the Respondent's intent to mislead Internet users into believing that the websites are affiliated with or endorsed by the Complainant, which supports an inference of bad faith registration and use of the Disputed Domain Names on behalf of the Respondent.

Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy provides that the use of a domain name to intentionally attempt "to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent's] web site or other online location, by creating a

likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the respondent's] web site or location or of a product or service on [the respondent's] web site or location" is evidence of registration and use in bad faith. In view of all the above, the Panel is of the opinion that the Respondent's intention was to attract Internet users to the webpages at the Disputed Domain Names, by creating a likelihood of confusion and making them believe that said webpages are held, controlled or related to the Complainant, for the Respondent's commercial gain.

The Panel also notes the Respondent's failure to submit a response in the present proceeding, which may be considered as a further indication of the Respondent's bad faith.

Further to all the above, 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 <cantor-stock.com>, and <cantor-stock.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Monica Novac/

Monica Novac

Sole Panelist

Date: January 7, 2026