

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ares Management LLC v. Domain Administrator
Case No. D2025-5020

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Ares Management LLC, United States of America ("United States" or "U.S."), represented by Greenberg Traurig, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Domain Administrator, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <aresmgmtco.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on December 3, 2025. On December 3, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same day, 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 (Not provided) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 5, 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 December 11, 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 12, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 1, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on January 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Elizabeth Ann Morgan as the sole panelist in this matter on January 15, 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.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant Ares Management LLC is a subsidiary of Ares Management, L.P., which is a publicly traded, leading global alternative asset manager with USD 596 billion of assets under management (“AUM”) and over 4,200 employees. Ares Management L.P.’s common shares are traded on New York Stock Exchange under the ticker symbol “ARES.” The Complainant seeks to deliver strong risk-adjusted investment returns to its investor base across its investment groups and strategies, including credit, private equity and real estate. The Complainant is headquartered in Los Angeles, United States, with over 55 global offices, including the United States, Europe, Asia, the Middle East, and Australia.

The Complainant has adopted and used the mark and trade name ARES continuously since at least September 1997. The Complainant has made extensive and continuous use of the ARES mark in the field of financial services, namely, investment advisory and investment management services for equity, real estate and credit-oriented pooled investment vehicles, private investment funds, and investment accounts. The Complainant is the owner of the trademark registrations that cover 57 countries, including for example, the following registrations in the United States (the “ARES Marks”):

ARES, U.S. Reg. No. 3014171, registered on November 8, 2005;
ARES MANAGEMENT, U.S. Reg. No. 3925366, registered on March 1, 2011; and
ARES CAPITAL MANAGEMENT, U.S. Reg. No. 3925365, registered on March 1, 2011.

Since March 19, 2002, the Complainant has owned the domain name <aresmgmt.com>, and since at least 2007, the Complainant has promoted and offered services through its website hosted on that domain name at “www.aresmgmt.com” (the “Ares Management Website”). The Complainant’s investors regularly use the Ares Management Website to access the Complainant’s services, and a large percentage of the Complainant’s business is generated through website traffic. In addition to the domain name <aresmgmt.com>, the Complainant owns numerous other domain names that incorporate its ARES trademark, including <aresmanagement.com>, <aresmanagementrealestate.com>, <arescapitalmgmt.com>, and <aresmgmtnotices.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 21, 2025.

The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that displays pay-per-click (PPC) or affiliate advertising links which presumably generate affiliate revenue for the Respondent when they are clicked by Internet users who arrive at the disputed domain name by accident when searching for the Complainant that redirect to other advertising webpages that contain PPC or affiliate links.

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 the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name, which is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s ARES mark in a manner to profit from the Complainant’s notoriety.

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 name. 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 ARES 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, "mgmtco", 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 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 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 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 has used the disputed domain name for attracting Internet users to a website that displays PPC or affiliate advertising links that presumably generate affiliate revenue for the Respondent when they are clicked by Internet users who arrive at the disputed domain name by accident when searching for Complainant. Panels have found that the use of a domain name to host a parked page comprising PPC links does not represent a bona fide offering where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant's mark or otherwise mislead Internet users. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9.

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 the Respondent registration and use of the disputed domain name is an intentional attempt to attract for commercial gain Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's mark.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

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 name <aresmgmtco.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Elizabeth Ann Morgan/

Elizabeth Ann Morgan

Sole Panelist

Date: January 27, 2026