

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Lennar Pacific Properties Management, LLC and Lennar Corporation v. Jay Feldman

Case No. D2025-5191

### **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 Jay Feldman, United States.

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

The disputed domain names <getlennar.com>, <golennar.com>, <lennarconnect.com>, <lennarhub.com>, and <trylennar.com> are registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on December 11, 2025. On December 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On December 13, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainants on December 15, 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 15, 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 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 7, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on January 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Lorelei Ritchie as the sole panelist in this matter on January 16, 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 Lennar Pacific Properties Management, Inc., together with affiliated company, Complainant Lennar Corporation are corporate entities based in the United States (hereinafter collectively, "Complainant"). For decades prior to the registration of the disputed domain names, Complainant has provided real estate management, brokerage, development, construction, and financial services under the mark LENNAR. Complainant owns several registrations for its LENNAR mark. These include United States Registration Nos. 3,108,401 (registered on June 27, 2006) and 3,477,143 (registered on July 29, 2008).

Complainant additionally interacts with consumers and prospective consumers via its online presence. In this regard, Complainant owns the registration for the domain name <lennar.com> (registered on September 4, 1996). Complainant uses the URL associated with this domain name to inform prospective consumers about its products and services offered under the LENNAR mark.

The disputed domain names were all registered on November 12, 2025. Respondent has used the disputed domain names to redirect users to Complainant's own website. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name <lennarconnect.com> redirects to the Complainant's website "www.lennar.com" while the other disputed domain names resolve to the webpages flagged as "Suspected Phishing."

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

##### **A. Complainant**

Complainant contends that (i) the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to Complainant's LENNAR trademarks; (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith.

In particular, Complainant contends that it has established rights in its registered LENNAR mark. Complainant alleges that each of the disputed domain names contains Complainant's LENNAR mark, with the addition only of dictionary terms as "get", "go", "connect", "hub", and "try". Complainant further contends that Respondent has used the disputed domain names to redirect web users to Complainant's own website, in an attempt to legitimize Respondent's apparently fraudulent activities. Complainant contends that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, and that it registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith, acting for Respondent's own commercial gain, while clearly aware of Complainant's rights in the LENNAR mark.

##### **B. Respondent**

Respondent did not reply to 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.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark, LENNAR, for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1. Although the addition of other terms (here, "get", "go", "connect", "hub", and "try") 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 names and Complainant's mark for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the LENNAR trademark in which Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

### **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 the disputed domain names.

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.

Complainant has provided evidence that the disputed domain names have been used to redirect users to an official website of Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, including fraudulent use, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds that Complainant has provided sufficient evidence of Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy which Respondent has not rebutted.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

There are several ways that a complainant can demonstrate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith. As noted in Section 4 of this Panel's Decision, the available record includes evidence that the disputed domain names have been used to redirect users to Complainant's own website. At the time of this Decision the disputed domain name <lennarconnect.com> still redirects to the Complainant's website "www.lennar.com" and fraudulent webpages under the other disputed domain names have been flagged as "Suspected Phishing." Hence, Respondent is trading on the goodwill of Complainant's trademarks to attract Internet users, apparently with knowledge of Complainant's rights to the LENNAR mark, and presumably for Respondent's own commercial gain.

Therefore, the Panel finds sufficient evidence that Respondent registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith for purposes of paragraph (4)(a)(iii) 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 <getlennar.com>, <golennar.com>, <lennarconnect.com>, <lennarhub.com>, and <trylennar.com> be transferred to Complainant Lennar Corporation.

*/Lorelei Ritchie/*

**Lorelei Ritchie**

Sole Panelist

Date: January 23, 2026