ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Cantor Fitzgerald Securities v. EMEKA CHARLES ORJI
Case No. D2025-4515

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Cantor Fitzgerald Securities, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Akerman LLP, United States.

The Respondent is EMEKA CHARLES ORJI, Nigeria.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <cantorfitzgeraldequitypartners.com> is registered with Porkbun LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 31, 2025. On November 3, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 26, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 26, 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 27, 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 December 2, 2025. The Respondent sent two email communications to the Center, on November 26, 2025 and December 2, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 22, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any formal response. Accordingly, the Center notified the commencement of the panel appointment process on December 23, 2025.

The Center appointed Edoardo Fano as the sole panelist in this matter on January 6, 2026. 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.

The Panel has not received any requests from the Complainant or the Respondent regarding further submissions, waivers, or extensions of deadlines, and the Panel has not found it necessary to request any further information from the Parties.

Having reviewed the communication records in the case file provided by the Center, the Panel finds that the Center has discharged its responsibility under the Rules, paragraph 2(a), "to employ reasonably available means calculated to achieve actual notice to [the] Respondent". Therefore, the Panel shall issue its Decision based upon the Complaint, the Policy, the Rules, and the Supplemental Rules and without the benefit of a formal response from the Respondent.

The language of the proceeding is English, being the language of the Registration Agreement, as per paragraph 11(a) of the Rules.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is Cantor Fitzgerald Securities, a United States company operating in the financial field and owning several trademark registrations for CANTOR and CANTOR FITZGERALD, among which:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 2,682,690 CANTOR, registered on February 4, 2003;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 2,682,691 CANTOR FITZGERALD, registered on February 4, 2003;
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 003380541 CANTOR, registered on January 21, 2005;
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 003283041 CANTOR FITZGERALD, registered on February 1, 2005.

The Complainant also operates on the Internet, being "www.cantor.com" its official website, together with "www.cantorfitzgerald.com".

The Complainant provided evidence in support of the above.

According to the WhoIs records, the disputed domain name was registered on September 16, 2024, and it is inactive. However, when the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name redirected to a website where the disputed domain name was offered for sale.

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 states that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademarks CANTOR and CANTOR FITZGERALD, as the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's trademarks.

Moreover, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since it has not been authorized by the Complainant to register the disputed domain name, or to use its trademarks within the disputed domain name, it is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, and it is not making either a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The Respondent uses the disputed domain name to offer it for sale for profit, capitalizing on the Complainant's trademarks renown in the financial field.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith, since the Complainant's trademarks CANTOR and CANTOR FITZGERALD are well known in the financial field. Therefore, the Respondent targeted the Complainant's trademarks at the time of registration of the disputed domain name and the Complainant contends that the use of the disputed domain name to offer it for sale for profit, capitalizing on the Complainant's trademarks renown in the financial field, qualifies as bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

The Respondent has made no formal reply to the Complainant's contentions. However, as noted above, the Respondent sent the following two informal email communications to the Center:

"Hello, my only response is that they could have simply responded to my emails to them - as I offered to sell the domain to them at any price they deemed okay." (On November 26, 2025)

"Kindly be advised that this domain is no longer in my custody. I explained few months ago." (On December 2, 2025)

A respondent is not obliged to participate in a proceeding under the Policy, but if it fails to do so, reasonable facts asserted by a complainant may be taken as true, and appropriate inferences, in accordance with paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, may be drawn. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.0"), section 4.3.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements, which the Complainant must satisfy in order to succeed:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
(ii) the 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 the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 Complainant's trademarks is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.7.

While the addition of other terms, here "equity" and "partners", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.8.

It is also well accepted that a generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), in this case ".com", is typically ignored when assessing the similarity between a trademark and a domain name. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, 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.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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 record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. 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 name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Respondent was offering the disputed domain name for sale for profit, capitalizing on the Complainant's trademarks renowned in the financial field.

The Panel therefore concludes that the disputed domain name is not being used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Moreover, the Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.5.1.

Based on the available record, 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, regarding the registration in bad faith of the disputed domain name, the reputation of the Complainant's trademarks CANTOR and CANTOR FITZGERALD in the financial field is clearly established. The Panel finds that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and deliberately registered the confusingly similar disputed domain name in bad faith, especially because the disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's trademarks with the addition of the terms "equity" and "partners", both referring to the Complainant's field of activity.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name was also used in bad faith, since the Respondent was offering the disputed domain name for sale for profit, capitalizing on the Complainant's trademarks renown in the financial field. WIPO Overview 3.0, sections 3.1.1.

As regards the current use of the disputed domain name, being inactive, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.3. Having reviewed the record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant's trademarks in the financial field, the nature of the disputed domain name (which consists of the Complainant's trademarks, with the addition of the terms "equity" and "partners", both referring to the Complainant's field of activity), the prior use of the disputed domain name and the failure of the Respondent to submit a formal Response or provide any explanation for its motivations in registering the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case, the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Furthermore, the Panel considers that the nature of the inherently misleading disputed domain name, which consists of the Complainant's trademarks, with the addition of the terms "equity" and "partners", both referring to the Complainant's field of activity, further supports a finding of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.2.1.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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, <cantorfitzgeraldequitypartners.com>, be transferred to the Complainant.

/Edoardo Fano/
Edoardo Fano
Sole Panelist
Date: January 13, 2026