

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

N. M. Rothschild & Sons Limited v. rothland moore, chila roth
Case No. D2025-5053

1. The Parties

The Complainant is N. M. Rothschild & Sons Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Freshfields LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is rothland moore and chila roth, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <rothschildandco-am.com> is registered with Name SRS AB.
The disputed domain name <rothschildandco-pw.com> is registered with Global Domain Group LLC.
The disputed domain name <rothschildandco-wm.com> is registered with Metaregistrar BV (the “Registrars”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 5, 2025. On December 5, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On December 6, 2025, December 7, 2025, and December 8 2025, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Unknown / Global Domain Group Privacy Service) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 11, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on December 15, 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 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on January 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Dr. Clive N.A. Trotman as the sole panelist in this matter on January 19, 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 is part of the Rothschild & Co group, a major provider of financial services internationally of some 200 years standing. Financial services provided by the Complainant range from merger and acquisition consultancy for large institutions, to wealth management for individuals and families.

The Complainant holds registered trademarks for ROTHSCCHILD or ROTHSCCHILD & CO, of which the following are representative:

ROTHSCCHILD, United Kingdom Intellectual Property Office (UKIPO), filed October 1, 1986, registered October 12, 1990, registration number 1285832, in class 36;

ROTHSCCHILD & CO, UKIPO, filed June 29, 2018, registered November 23, 2018, registration number 3321370, in classes 35 and 36.

The Respondent has not provided any background information. Such contact information as was provided by the Respondent at the time of registration of the disputed domain names may be unreliable. In respect of the disputed domain names <rothschildandco-pw.com> and <rothschildandco-wm.com> the Respondent gave a postcode corresponding to a different street name, and in respect of the disputed domain name <rothschildandco-am.com> the Respondent provided a fictitious postcode.

The disputed domain names were registered on the following dates: <rothschildandco-pw.com> on November 3, 2025; <rothschildandco-wm.com> on November 19, 2025; and <rothschildandco-am.com> on November 24, 2025.

The disputed domain names have not resolved to any active websites. They have, however, been incorporated into the email addresses of email letters, received and forwarded by their respective recipients to the Complainant, which has disclaimed them to be false and fraudulent. The letters were written in brochure format in financial technical language offering purported investment opportunities and signed falsely with the true name of an actual employee of the Complainant.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant submits that the Respondent in respect of the disputed domain names <rothschildandco-pw.com> and <rothschildandco-wm.com>, and the Respondent in respect of the disputed domain name <rothschildandco-am.com> which gave a different address, are one and the same entity or that all three disputed domain names are under common control.

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the trademarks in which the Complainant has rights. The dispute domain names incorporate the entirety of the Complainant's ROTHSCCHILD trademark, and the entirety of the Complainant's ROTHSCCHILD & CO trademark except for the replacement of the ampersand symbol "&" in the trademark with "and" in the disputed domain names, which does not avoid confusing similarity.

The Complainant says the suffixes "-pw", "-wm" or "-am" suffixed to the disputed domain names are of significance in the context of the Complainant's core business because "-pw" means "Private Wealth", "-wm" means "Wealth Management", and "-am" means "Asset Management". Thus, each suffix adds to the confusing similarity.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Complainant has no relationship or connection with the Respondent and has not authorised the Respondent to use the Complainant's trademark in any way. There is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain names. None of the disputed domain names lead to an active website, or has been used for any bona fide offering of goods or services, or has been used for a fair or noncommercial purpose.

The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The disputed domain names have been used in order to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant says its trademarks are extremely well known and embody the Complainant's substantial goodwill. The Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant's trademarks rights at the time of registration of the disputed domain names. Previous decisions under the Policy have held that the Complainant's trademarks are distinctive in connection with banking and financial services, having been in use for two hundred years.

The disputed domain names have been used as the origination email addresses of letters sent to prospective investors in order to try to sell purported fixed rate bonds. The letters were headed with the Complainant's name and logo and bear the typed signature and designation of an employee of the Complainant, together with the Complainant's physical address but with an email address incorporating one of the disputed domain names. The Complainant submits that this activity constitutes registration and use of the disputed domain names in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Complainant has cited previous decisions under the Policy in which the Complainant prevailed.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain names.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 4.11.2.

The disputed domain names <rothschildandco-pw.com> and <rothschildandco-wm.com> were registered under the same registrant contact details, whereas <rothschildandco-am.com> was registered differently. The Panel notes that all three disputed domain names were registered in the three-week period from November 3, 2025 to November 24, 2025. All disputed domain names follow exactly the same pattern. Each is constructed of the Complainant's trademark in which "& co" is replaced with "andco", followed by a hyphen, then a two-letter abbreviation that reasonably corresponds to a business activity associated with the Complainant, followed by ".com". In other words, all three disputed domain names are identical except for the suffixed two letter abbreviation corresponding to a financial business activity.

Both registrants gave inconsistent or non-existing postcodes. Both registrants incorporated the string "roth" in their names in the registration details. All three disputed domain names have been used in the same way as email addresses for sending superficially convincing prospectuses soliciting purported investments, signed over the name of a real employee of the Complainant. The prospectuses sent under all three disputed domain names had considerable areas of identical script. Each email address was of the format "admin@" followed by the respective disputed domain name.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

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.

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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. The Complainant's trademark ROTHSCILD appears in full in each disputed domain name. The Complainant's trademark ROTHSCILD & CO appears in each disputed domain name with "and" substituted for "&", which the Panel finds not to prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "-pw", "-aw" or "-am") 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 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, claimed impersonation) 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.

Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy reads as follows:

“(iv) by using the domain name, you [the Respondent] have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your web site or location or of a product or service on your web site or location”.

The disputed domain names appear not to have been used for any websites. All three have, however, been used for email addresses in the format “admin@” prefixed to the respective disputed domain name. The Complainant has produced in evidence copies of emails sent to potential investors, who have become suspicious of the emails and have forwarded them to the Complainant, which has declared them to be fake letters impersonating the Complainant.

The emails sent by the Respondent can be described as determined and sophisticated. Each letter is in the form of a brochure impersonating the Complainant and setting out the Complainant’s virtues including its history, reputation, stability, and care for its clients. There follows a series of financially technical paragraphs about the nature and terms of the purported investment, with assurances that deposits would be protected under the terms of the Financial Services Compensation Scheme. Specific purported investments offered through the individual disputed domain names were for HSBC Holdings PLC, Barclays Bank PLC, or Santander UK PLC, each described identically as being “A high-quality financial institution vetted through Rothschild & Co’s fixed-income due-diligence process”. Interest rates offered were all in the range 6.125% pa to 10.0625% pa, i.e., such that targeted individuals might find them to be attractive but not necessarily suspicious.

In the terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy above, each disputed domain name has been used in such a way as to impersonate the Complainant and to create a likelihood that recipients, at least initially, may confuse them with the Complainant's trademark; each has been used with intent to attract a reply to the Respondent's online location, namely the associated email address; and each has been used with intent to extract money from the relevant recipient for the Respondent's commercial gain. On the evidence and on the balance of probabilities, the Panel finds that each disputed domain name has been used in bad faith in the terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, and was registered in bad faith for the purpose for which it has been used.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, impersonation) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of each disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under 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 names <rothschildandco-am.com>, <rothschildandco-pw.com> and <rothschildandco-wm.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Dr. Clive N.A. Trotman/

Dr. Clive N.A. Trotman

Sole Panelist

Date: January 29, 2026