

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lennar Pacific Properties Management, LLC and Lennar Corporation v. Le Nena

Case No. D2026-1076

1. The Parties

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

Respondent is Le Nena, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lennar.store> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 12, 2026. On March 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 16, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name that differed from the named Respondent (The RDAP server redacted the value, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on March 16, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on March 16, 2026.

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 March 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 12, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on April 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Jeffrey D. Steinhardt as sole panelist in this matter on April 24, 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

Complainants offer real estate management, brokerage, development, construction, mortgage, and financial services.

Complainant Lennar Pacific Properties Management, LLC owns various registered trademarks for its LENNAR marks including, for example, United States Trademark Registration No. 3,108,401, registered on June 27, 2006, in international classes 35, 36 and 37, with a first use in commerce date of May 1973; and United States Trademark Registration No. 3,477,143, registered on July 29, 2008, in international classes 36 and 37.

The disputed domain name was registered January 28, 2026, and resolves to a webpage that displays links to third-party websites promoting apartment and house rentals.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainants

Complainants aver that they have been one of America's leading homebuilders since 1954 and build and sell homes in twenty-one states in the United States. Complainants allege that they have a common legal interest in rights that are affected by Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name; Complainants allege that Lennar Corporation is a related company and authorized licensee of the LENNAR marks that owns and operates the website at "www.lennar.com".

Complainants further aver that on February 5, 2026, a cease and desist letter was sent to Respondent, to which no reply has been received.

Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for transfer of the disputed domain name to Complainant Lennar Corporation.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainants' contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

As an initial matter, the Panel has determined that this case may proceed through consolidation of both Complainants in this single proceeding. See Policy paragraph 10(a).

The Panel agrees that Complainants have a specific common grievance against Respondent, and that Respondent has engaged in common conduct that has affected both Complainants in a similar fashion. The Panel finds that permitting this case to go forward with two Complainants favors due expedition, equity and fairness, without any resulting prejudice to Respondent. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.11.1.

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Complainants have shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds that the first element of paragraph 4(a) 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 that 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 3.1](#), section 2.1.

The Panel accepts Complainants' undisputed allegations that Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has no authorization or right to use Complainant Lennar Pacific Properties Management, LLC's marks. The record in this case shows that the disputed domain name resolves to a webpage displaying advertising links to third parties ("pay-per-click" or "PPC" links). The Panel finds that Respondent's use of PPC links without authorization or any other apparent legal right to use Complainant Lennar Pacific Properties Management, LLC's marks is not bona fide in the sense of the Policy.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that 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 that the second element of Policy paragraph 4(a) 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, Respondent deliberately registered the disputed domain name identical to the LENNAR marks. The record shows that Respondent is using it without authorization to direct Internet users to a pay-per-click website that has no apparent relation to Complainants' business under their registered marks. This direct targeting of Complainant Lennar Pacific Properties Management, LLC's marks is clear evidence of bad faith. The Panel finds that Respondent has "intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark" in the sense of paragraph 4(b) of the Policy.

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 also be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Respondent's failure to reply to Complainants' cease and desist letter and the notification of these proceedings provides further evidence of bad faith.

The Panel finds that Complainants have established the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 <lennar.store> be transferred to Complainant Lennar Corporation.

/Jeffrey D. Steinhardt/

Jeffrey D. Steinhardt

Sole Panelist

Date: May 1, 2026