

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Man Group plc v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2026-1277

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Man Group plc, United Kingdom, represented by Dehns, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Name Redacted.¹

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <maninvestments-ag.com> is registered with INWX GmbH & Co. KG (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 25, 2026. On March 25, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 26, 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 for Privacy, Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 27, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on March 31, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended 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”).

¹ The Respondent appears to have used the real address and telephone number of a third party when registering the disputed domain name. The name of the Respondent may also therefore belong to a real person. In the light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent’s name from this decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding, and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST- 12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 27, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 29, 2026.

On April 17, 2026, the Complainant sent an email to the Center to report that a letter sent by the Complainant to the Respondent's registered name and address had received a reply from the occupant of the address, stating that nobody having the name of the Respondent had ever resided at the house, which had been in the same family since it was built.

The Center appointed Dr. Clive N.A. Trotman as the sole panelist in this matter on May 5, 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

The Complainant is a global investment management company, with roots dating back to 1783 as a sugar cooperage and brokerage. The present scale of the Complainant is illustrated by its having some USD 227 billion under management as at December 31, 2025.

The Complainant, as a group, includes numerous wholly-owned indirect subsidiaries world-wide that include the word "Man" in their company names, including notably Man Investments AG (the Complainant's "Swiss subsidiary") and Man (Europe) AG.

The Complainant has produced a schedule of its portfolio of trademarks internationally running to about 124 trademarks. These include:

M MAN, figurative, United Kingdom Intellectual Property Office, filed May 13, 2010, registered September 17, 2010, registration number 2547917, in class 36. This trademark forms the Basic Application in respect of the European Community trademark number 1046727, registered June 22, 2010, in class 36. The Complainant has produced copies of certificates of registration for this trademark in Switzerland, Norway, and the United Kingdom.

The Complainant also uses the domain name <man.com>.

No significant background information is available about the Respondent. The disputed domain name was created on October 2, 2025 and has resolved to a website (the "Respondent's website") extending to some 41 pages as reproduced. The Respondent's website lists the registered address of the Complainant's subsidiary, Man Investments AG, as being its own, however the contact email provided by the Respondent's website is "support" at the disputed domain name, leading to the Respondent.

As mentioned above, a communication was received by the Complainant from the occupant of the street address disclosed for the Respondent, which address did exist, but who did not have the name disclosed for the Respondent. The occupant stated categorically that no person having the name of the Respondent had ever lived there. The Panel accepts, on balance, the occupant's assertions as being true and that their address and telephone number have been misappropriated at random by the Respondent. In the circumstances the Panel finds there to be at least a likelihood that the personal name disclosed for the Respondent could also be that of a real person, but with no realistic probability that it is the real name of the Respondent, and that it would be prudent for the name to be redacted from this Decision.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights. The disputed domain name comprises the entirety of the Complainant's trademark MAN, followed directly by the elements "investments-ag", followed by the generic Top-Level Domain ".com", which may be disregarded. The element "investments-ag" in the disputed domain name adds to confusing similarity because the Complainant's field of business is also investments and associated services, and the suffix "ag" is a part of the Complainant's Swiss subsidiary's name, Man Investments AG.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant says the Respondent must have had prior knowledge of the Complainant, its business and its trademark, and has set out to deceive clients by offering similar services in the name of the Complainant through the Respondent's website. The Respondent falsely claims on its website to have a physical address that is in fact the address of the Complainant's Swiss subsidiary. Potential clients are invited to open accounts at various levels from an entry level USD 100 to a platinum account with USD 200,000, and would mistakenly believe they were depositing money with the Complainant, not the Respondent. Potential clients would be disclosing their sensitive personal information.

The Respondent therefore cannot be making a bona fide offering of goods or services, or making fair or legitimate noncommercial use of the disputed domain name, and there is no evidence the Respondent has been known by a name similar to the disputed domain name.

The Complainant reports correspondence from a person who states they were deceived by the Respondent into making payments on two occasions for a purported internal audit relating to a trade.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent is intentionally attracting Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant for commercial gain. The Respondent has created the disputed domain name to resemble closely the Complainant's trademark as it appears in many of the Complainant's group of companies, especially the Complainant's Swiss subsidiary, Man Investments AG. The Respondent has used the corresponding website to appear to be the Complainant by confusion and to invite Internet visitors to open accounts and transfer money to the Respondent.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the 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 Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainant has 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 word element of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, “investments-ag”) 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 mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Whilst the word element of the Complainant’s registered trademark, MAN, is a dictionary term, the Complainant’s trademark as cited in section 4 above is a figurative trademark, or logo, comprising the bold letter M above the word MAN, in which the word element MAN is entirely clear. Most of the Complainant’s 124 trademarks are in similar style. In any event, the Panel also notes that both the composition of the disputed domain name (incorporating additional terms related to a subsidiary’s business formation) and the content of the website further support the finding of confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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 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.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the 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.

The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent, by effectively masquerading as the Complainant in the same field of business, namely money management on behalf of clients, and by soliciting money for purported investment purposes in the name and address of the Complainant’s Swiss subsidiary, is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services, or making a fair or legitimate noncommercial use of the disputed domain name. There is no evidence the Respondent has ever been known by the disputed domain name or similar.

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.

Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy reads as follows:

“by using the domain name, you [the Respondent] have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of your website or location or of a product or service on your website or location.”

The Respondent's website is reached by means of the disputed domain name which, as found above, is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark and in particular to the name of the Complainant's Swiss subsidiary.

Screen captures of the Respondent's website produced in evidence show the website to be extensive, running to some 41 captured pages, some of which may overlap. Every page is marked in the top left corner with the prominent word “MAN” above “Investments AG” in small type and thereby purports to be the website of the Complainant's Swiss subsidiary. The Respondent's website claims to have a Swiss address that is the same as the Complainant's address, and a street map of the locality is provided to enhance the deception. The Respondent's website may be described as professionally styled at some cost in time or money. The pages repetitively extol the virtues of investing with the Respondent (impersonating the Complainant) and make liberal use of familiar financial terms such as stocks, foreign exchange, commodities, and the like. Readers are told of the Respondent's claimed reliability, experience and the opportunities offered to investors. Later pages solicit money to open an account at levels ranging from entry level to platinum and invite prospective clients to contact the Respondent through an email address based on the disputed domain name.

In terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy the Respondent is found on the evidence to have attempted to attract Internet users to its website by a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark and to have attempted to induce visitors to send money that would accrue to the Respondent's commercial gain.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

The Complainant referred to a letter from an investor stating that they had actually been deceived twice into sending money to the Respondent for supposed audits in connection with a trade. No supporting evidence was produced such as a copy of redacted correspondence from the third party. Accordingly, the Panel has not considered these claims in its above findings, which, in any event, are not necessary as the Complainant has supported a finding of bad faith with other evidence.

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 <maninvestments-ag.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Dr. Clive N.A. Trotman/

Dr. Clive N.A. Trotman

Sole Panelist

Date: May 19, 2026