

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ares Management LLC v. matthew dev, developer
Case No. D2025-5079

1. The Parties

Complainant is Ares Management LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Greenberg Traurig LLP, United States.

Respondent is matthew dev, developer, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <aresmgmtcorp.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (“Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (“Center”) on December 5, 2025. On December 8, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 9, 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 (DT), Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot). The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on December 9, 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 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 (“Policy”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (“Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (“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 12, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 1, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on January 2, 2026.

The Center appointed Debra J. Stanek as the sole panelist in this matter on January 8, 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 subsidiary of Ares Management, L.P., a publicly traded asset management company. Complainant's parent company trades under the symbol "ARES".

Complainant owns the following United States trademark registrations:

- ARES - Reg. No. 3,014,171, registered November 8, 2005, for investment management services;
- ARES and design - Reg. No. 3,925,367, registered March 1, 2011, for financial services; and
- ARES MANAGEMENT - Reg. No. 3,925,366, registered March 1, 2011, for financial services.

The <aresmgmt.com> domain name is used by Complainant or its parent company for the business' principal website; and the domain name is also used for the business' official email addresses.

The disputed domain name was created on February 20, 2025.

The disputed domain name did not lead to an active website as of the filing of the Complaint and at the time of this Decision. According to the Complaint, Respondent has used the disputed domain name in an email address used to send email messages purporting to be from Complainant.

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.

In particular:

- The disputed domain name consists of Complainant's ARES mark and the terms "mgmt" and "corp". The term "mgmt" means, and would be understood as, an abbreviation of the term "management", as in Complainant's ARES MANAGEMENT mark, and is consistent with Complainant's <aresmgmt.com> domain name and the term "corp" means, and would be understood as, an abbreviation for "corporation" referring to a corporate structure.
- Respondent has not been authorized or permitted to use the disputed domain name.
- Respondent is using the disputed domain name to impersonate Complainant. Respondent created an email address using the disputed domain name and the initial of the first name and the last name of one of Complainant's executives. That email address was used to communicate with a third party concerning a payment; and the signature block includes the full name of Complainant's executive, further identifying the individual with a role in human resources.
- Respondent provided false contact information to the Registrar. Complainant's investigation disclosed that the address in the registration corresponded to a regional chamber of commerce while the telephone number's outgoing message identified an individual with a different name from that in the registration.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

To prevail under the Policy a complainant must prove, as to the domain name at issue, that: (a) it is identical or confusingly similar to a mark in which the complainant has rights, (b) respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect to it, and (c) it has been registered and is being used in bad faith. Policy, paragraph 4(a). A respondent's failure to respond does not automatically result in a finding for the complainant; the complainant continues to have the burden of establishing each element. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.3. The Panel may, however, draw appropriate inferences from the default. See Rules, paragraph 14(b).

The Panel determines that "matthew dev, developer" is the appropriate Respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.4.5; in a case involving a privacy service, a panel has discretion to determine the appropriate respondent.

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 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.

Complainant's mark is not identical to the disputed domain name. However, the entire ARES mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, followed by "mgmt" and "corp". Despite these additions, the Panel finds that the ARES and ARES MANAGEMENT marks are recognizable within the disputed domain name. Although the additional terms may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the additions do not prevent a determination 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 proceedings under the Policy 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 remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

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. Complainant has provided

credible evidence that Respondent used the disputed domain name to impersonate Complainant in communications with a third party. Consistent with determinations by other panels, the Panel finds that such use does not 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. The list in paragraph 4(b) is not exhaustive; 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.

Here, Complainant's rights in the ARES and ARES MANAGEMENT marks long predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name simply adds two well-known abbreviations "mgmt" (correlating to "management", generally, and in the ARES MANAGEMENT mark) and "corp" (correlating to "corporation" and, in the Panel's view, likely to be understood as a reference to a corporate form), making good faith use implausible.

Complainant's evidence shows that Respondent used the disputed domain name in an effort to pass itself off as Complainant by impersonating one of Complainant's executives in email messages to third parties. Respondent did not respond to the Complaint. Further, the Respondent concealed its identity in the publicly available Whois records and also appears to have provided false contact information when registering the disputed domain name. Under these circumstances, the Panel finds Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <aresmgmtcorp.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Debra J. Staneck/

Debra J. Staneck

Sole Panelist

Date: January 19, 2026