

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Freeman Holding, LLC v. Teresa Freeman, wwwfreeman.com
Case No. D2025-5033

1. The Parties

Complainant is Freeman Holding, LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Porter Wright Morris & Arthur, LLP, United States.

Respondent is Teresa Freeman, wwwfreeman.com, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 4, 2025. On December 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 4, 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 for Privacy, wwwfreeman.com) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on December 5, 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 December 9, 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 December 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 30, 2025. Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on December 17, 2025 that did not address the substance of the Complainant but rather stated that Respondent “did not mean to create that account it was done by accident. I have deleted the whole thing”. The Center

contacted the Parties on December 17, 2025 regarding Respondent's response and inquiring as to whether the Parties desired to suspend the proceeding in order to explore settlement options. On December 24, 2025, Complainant replied to the Center that prior attempts to communicate with Respondent had been unsuccessful and there was no evidence Respondent had deleted the account for the disputed domain name and therefore it did not wish to suspend the proceeding.

The Center appointed Timothy D. Casey as the sole panelist in this matter on January 14, 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

Complainant is a global event planning and management company established in 1927. Complainant has used the mark and trade name FREEMAN since at least 1927 and owns various trademark registrations in different jurisdictions that consist of the mark FREEMAN or contain FREEMAN as part of the mark (the "FREEMAN Marks"), including:

Mark	Jurisdiction	Class(es)	Registration No.	Registration Date
FREEMAN	United States	37, 39, 40, 42, and 43	2645625	November 5, 2002
FREEMAN	United States	35, 38, and 41	5518973	July 17, 2018
FREEMAN	United States	35	5844659	August 27, 2019

Complainant owns and operates a website at the domain name <freeman.com> for most aspects of its business, such as advertising and marketing to customers.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 13, 2025. At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to web page displaying an abstract image and stating "We're under construction. Please check back for an update soon.".

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 has rights in the FREEMAN Marks, as set forth herein, and that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the FREEMAN Marks because it constitutes typosquatting and impersonation of the FREEMAN Marks and is therefore confusingly similar. Complainant contends that the addition of the non-distinctive term "www" in the disputed domain name does not prevent the confusing similarity. Complainant further contends the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") should be disregarded for purpose of this analysis.

Complainant contends that Respondent has no rights to or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and that Respondent's use is unauthorized and is intended for commercial gain apart from any reasonable fair use. Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was subject to a decision in *Freeman Holding, LLC v. 杨智超 (Zhi Chao Yang)*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-1170](#) involving a different respondent and resulting in the ordered transfer of the disputed domain name to Complainant, but due to difficulties with the registrar at that time the transfer was never completed, leaving the disputed domain name available for registration by Respondent.

Complainant contends that Respondent is not commonly known by the dispute domain name, is not associated with Complainant and has acquired no right to use the disputed domain name. Complainant contends that Respondent's use of the disputed domain name cannot be considered a bona fide offering as it is meant to confuse Internet users as to source or affiliation for Respondent's commercial gain.

Complainant contends that Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name was in bad faith because Respondent clearly knew of the FREEMAN Marks and chose the disputed domain name in order to impersonate Complainant as evidenced by the typosquatting nature of the disputed domain name. Complainant further contends that Respondent's use constitutes passive holding when the distinctiveness of Complainant's mark is considered along with evidence of Respondent's concealed identity and the implausibility of the disputed domain name being used in good faith.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not substantively reply to Complainant's contentions. Respondent did reply but merely stated that Respondent "did not mean to create the account it was done by accident. I have deleted the whole thing".

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 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 a trademark or service 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 other term here, "www", 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 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 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.

The Panel also finds that while Respondent's registrant contact information indicates that Respondent's last name is "Freeman", and organization is "wwwfreeman.com", Respondent has not refuted Complainant's contention that Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name. Rather, Respondent responded by stating that the account (presumably the disputed domain name account with the Registrar) was created by accident and should be deleted. Accordingly, the Panel finds that Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name for the purposes of the Policy and has not put forward any claims of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Moreover, the Panel notes that the composition of the dispute domain name, incorporating the Complainant's long registered mark and "www" appears intended to mimic Complainant's domain name when viewed on the World Wide Web at "www.freeman.com", which in these circumstances further supports a finding that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests.

The Panel further notes that while the same disputed domain name was previously ordered to be transferred to Complainant in *Freeman Holding, LLC v. 杨智超 (Zhi Chao Yang)*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-1170](#), that Case involved a different respondent and different facts and is not relevant to this proceeding.

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 knew or should have known of the existence of the FREEMAN Marks and Complainant's rights therein, which is sufficient to establish bad faith registration.

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.

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 available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of 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. In this regard, Respondent's unsupported claim that the registration of the disputed domain name was "done by accident", in the context of a recent registration incorporating the suspect additional term "www" and suspect registrant data, further supports a finding of bad faith.

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 <wwwfreeman.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Timothy D. Casey/

Timothy D. Casey

Sole Panelist

Date: January 26, 2026