

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lennar Pacific Properties Management, LLC, Lennar Corporation v. bob gaskie

Case No. D2026-1101

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 bob gaskie, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

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

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 13, 2026. On March 16, 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 which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainants on March 17, 2026, 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 March 17, 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 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 8, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on April 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Richard W. Page as the sole panelist in this matter on April 22, 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 homes 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 their business.

Complainants are the owners 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 on February 20, 2026, and Complainants have provided evidence that it has been used as part of an email address to impersonate one of Complainants' employees.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainants

Complainants contend that the Disputed Domain Name is virtually identical and/or confusingly similar form of typosquatting, using the LENNAR Mark in its entirety, with the deletion of the letter “n” in “lennar” and the addition of the word “corporation.”

Complainants submit that Respondent has not made any bona fide offering of goods or services using the Disputed Domain Name. Complainants further submit that Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. Complainants further submit that Respondent is not making any noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name. Respondent has in fact used the Disputed Domain Name to impersonate Complainants, presumably for fraud and commercial gain and to misleadingly divert Complainants' consumers.

Complainants allege that Respondent through the Disputed Domain Name purports to offer services similar to those offered by Complainants in the regular course of their business. The Disputed Domain Name alone illustrates bad faith and an effort to fraudulently mislead consumers into believing that Respondent offers services that are offered by Complainants. Moreover, it is well settled that the practice of typosquatting itself constitutes evidence of bad faith.

Complainants further allege that Respondent has been using the Disputed Domain Name to spoof legitimate email addresses and impersonate employees of Complainants, presumably in an attempt to fraudulently redirect funds and/or materials and parts. Specifically, the Disputed Domain Name is being used on LinkedIn to impersonate an employee. Complainants further allege that use of the Disputed Domain Name as part of a fraudulent scheme, including impersonation of an employee, is “quintessential 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 three essential elements of the claims are met. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on UDRP Select Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), 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

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1 states that registration of a trademark, here the LENNAR Mark, prima facie satisfies the threshold requirement of Complainants having trademark rights for purposes of standing to file a UDRP case.

Complainants have shown rights in respect of the LENNAR Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The majority of the LENNAR 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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here the deletion of the letter "n" in "Lennar" and the addition of the word "corporation," may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such deletion and addition 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 3.1](#), 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 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 that 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 makes 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 3.1](#), 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.

Panels have held that the use of the Disputed Domain Name for illegitimate activity, here claimed as impersonation of an employee, phishing, and a fraudulent email scheme, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets forth four nonexclusive criteria for Complainants to show bad faith registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name:

- (i) circumstances indicating that you [Respondent] have registered or you have acquired the Disputed Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Disputed Domain Name registration to Complainants who are the owners of the LENNAR Mark or to a competitor of Complainants, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the Disputed Domain Name; or
- (ii) you [Respondent] have registered the Disputed Domain Name in order to prevent the owner of the LENNAR Mark from reflecting the LENNAR Mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) you [Respondent] have registered the Disputed Domain Name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) by using the Disputed Domain Name, you [Respondent] have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the LENNAR Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product on your website or location.

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.

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 is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have held that the use of the Disputed Domain Name for purposes other than to host a website may constitute bad faith. Such active ("behind the scenes") uses are considered distinct from the passive holding doctrine discussed above, and can include a range of bad faith activity or scams such as sending email and phishing. Many such cases involve Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name to send deceptive emails, e.g., to obtain sensitive or confidential personal information (phishing) or other fraudulent schemes. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Panels have held that the use of the Disputed Domain Name for illegitimate activity, here claimed as impersonation of an employee, phishing and a fraudulent email scheme, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <lennarcorporation.com> be transferred to Lennar Corporation.

/Richard W. Page/

Richard W. Page

Sole Panelist

Date: May 5, 2026