

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Lennar Pacific Properties Management, LLC, Lennar Corporation v. Carla Wright, realtor  
Case No. D2025-5154

### **1. The Parties**

Complainants are Lennar Pacific Properties Management, LLC, and Lennar Corporation, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Slates Harwell Campbell, LLP, United States.

Respondent is Carla Wright, realtor, United States.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The Disputed Domain Name <lennarhomesflorida.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on December 10, 2025. On December 11, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On December 11, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainants on December 12, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainants filed an amendment to the Complaint on December 12, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 19, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 8, 2026. Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on December 15, 2025. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties of the Commencement of Panel Appointment Process on January 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Richard W. Page 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**

Since 1954, Complainants have developed, built, and sold home in twenty-one (21) states in the United States. Complainants have offered real estate management, brokerage, development, construction, mortgage, and financial services under the LENNAR Mark since at least as early as 1973.

In connection with these services, Complainants own and operate a website utilizing the LENNAR Mark, located at "www.lennar.com". In addition, Complainants use the domain "@lennar.com" to conduct all email correspondence for the entirety of its business.

The Complainant Lennar Pacific Properties Management, LLC is the owner of the following trademark registrations for the LENNAR Mark:

United States Registration No. 3,108,401 for LENNAR on June 27, 2006 in international classes 35, 36, and 37; and

United States Registration No. 3,477,143 for LENNAR on July 29, 2008 in international classes 36 and 37.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered November 7, 2025 and resolves to a website with competing pay-per-click ("PPC") links.

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainants**

Complainants contend that they have enforceable trademark rights in the LENNAR Mark for purposes of this proceeding. Complainants further contend that Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name is virtually identical and/or confusingly similar to the LENNAR Mark in its entirety, with only the addition of the descriptive words "homes" and "florida" after the word "lennar."

Complainants submit that Respondent has not used the Disputed Domain Name for any bona fide offering of goods or services. Complainants further submit that the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website with competing PPC links demonstrating that Respondent is intentionally attempting to attract or divert, for commercial gain, Internet users and creating further confusion with respect to the LENNAR Mark as to the source sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent's website.

In addition, upon information and belief, Complainants further submit that Respondent has not been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name and has not acquired trademark or service mark rights in the LENNAR Mark. Respondent is not making any legitimate non-commercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain name and instead is using the Disputed Domain Name to typo squat and to impersonate Complainants, presumably for fraud and commercial gain and/or to tarnish the LENNAR Mark.

Complainants further submit that they sent a cease and desist letter to Respondent on November 12, 2015 regarding registration of the Disputed Domain Name, and that Respondent has failed to respond to date or otherwise provide any explanation regarding registration or use of the Disputed Domain Name.

Complainants further submit that Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name with PPC links, even if parked, does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate noncommercial or fair use

especially when such links compete with or capitalize of the reputation and goodwill of the LENNAR Mark or otherwise mislead Internet users.

Complainants do not allege any violations of paragraph 4(b) of the Policy. Complainants do allege that the factors in paragraph 4(b) are nonexclusive, then cite to additional factors to be considered in the Panel's analysis of bad faith.

Complainants allege that Respondent has registered and used the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith. Complainants further allege that Respondent has (1) parked the Disputed Domain Name with a PPC functionality, (2) failed to respond to Complainants' cease and desist letter, and (3) concealed its identity by using a Privacy setting with the Registrar.

Complainants further allege that Respondent's choice for the Disputed Domain Name is simply a cybersquatting scheme, which is further evidence of bad faith.

Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

## **B. Respondent**

Respondent did not reply to Complainants' contentions.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs the Panel as to the principles the Panel is to use in determining the dispute: "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules, and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable."

Even though Respondent has failed to file a Response or to contest Complainants' assertions, the Panel will review the evidence proffered by Complainants to verify that the essential elements of the claims are met. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.3.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that Complainants must prove each of the following three elements:

- i) that the Disputed Domain Name registered by Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to the LENNAR Mark in which Complainants have rights; and,
- ii) that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name; and,
- iii) that the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

In line with [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1, registration of the LENNAR Mark is prima facie evidence of Complainants having enforceable rights in the LENNAR Mark.

Complainants have shown rights in respect of the LENNAR Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

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 LENNAR Mark and the Disputed Domain Name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the LENNAR Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here the words “homes” and “florida,” 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 LENNAR 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 the Disputed Domain Name.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy allows three nonexclusive methods for the Panel to conclude that Respondent has rights or a legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name:

- (i) before any notice to you [Respondent] of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Disputed Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) you [Respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) you [Respondent] are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the LENNAR Mark.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on Complainants, panels have recognized that proving Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name may result in the difficult task of “proving a negative”, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of Respondent. As such, where Complainants make out a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name (although the burden of proof always remains on Complainants). If Respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, Complainants are deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds Complainants have established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. Respondent has not rebutted Complainants’ 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 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 the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

The Panel further notes that Complainants have not alleged a violation of paragraph 4(b), but have alleged additional factors relating to bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name was in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Complainants allege that Respondent's choice for the Disputed Domain Name is simply a cybersquatting scheme, which is evidence of bad faith – as is Respondent's failure to reply to Complainants' cease and desist letter.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the LENNAR Mark, the composition of the Disputed Domain Name, the use of PPC, and the use of a Privacy setting and finds that in the circumstances of this case the Disputed Domain Name was registered and used in bad faith.

The Panel finds that Complainants have 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 <lennarhomesflorida.com> be transferred to Complainants.

*/Richard W. Page/*

**Richard W. Page**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 27, 2026