

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

N. M. Rothschild & Sons Limited v. Tod Guard
Case No. D2026-1365

1. The Parties

The Complainant is N. M. Rothschild & Sons Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Freshfields LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Tod Guard, Israel.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <rothschildidentity.com> and <rothschildprivefinance.com> are registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 31, 2026. On March 31, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On April 1, 2026, 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 (“Unknown”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 1, 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 April 4, 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”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 3, 2026. The Response was filed with the Center on May 2, 2026.

The Center appointed W. Scott Blackmer as the sole panelist in this matter on May 18, 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 company incorporated in England and Wales on January 1, 1968, with its registered office in London, United Kingdom. The company is a member of Rothschild & Co. group, which has provided financial and investment advice and merger and acquisitions (“M&A”) and wealth management solutions to institutions, families, individuals, and governments for over two hundred years under names containing ROTHSCCHILD or ROTHSCCHILD & CO. The group operates a website at “www.rothschildandco.com” (the “Complainant’s website”), which describes the group’s team of 4800 financial services specialists in 50 countries (including Israel, where the Respondent is located). The group reported nearly EUR 3 billion in revenue in 2025. (The Complainant’s website is registered to Rothschild & Co Continuation Holdings AG, an affiliate of the Complainant, which has also registered other domain names that incorporate the ROTHSCCHILD name.)

The Complainant or affiliates in the Rothschild & Co. group hold relevant trademark registrations including the following:

Mark	Jurisdiction	Reg. Number	Reg. Date	International Class
ROTHSCCHILD (word) (held by Complainant)	United Kingdom	UK00001168291	January 21, 1982	14
ROTHSCCHILD (word) (held by affiliate ROBRIP II AG)	European Union	000206458	October 8, 1998	14, 35, 36
ROTHSCCHILD & CO (word) (held by Rothschilds Continuation Holdings AG)	United States of America	5614371	November 27, 2018	35, 36

The Complainant is licensed to use those marks held by affiliates.

Multiple UDRP panels have recognized that the Complainant’s marks are long-established and well-known worldwide. See, e.g., *N. M. Rothschild & Sons Limited v. Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2835](#).

The disputed domain name <rothschildprivefinance.com> was created on December 13, 2025, and the disputed domain name <rothschildidentity.com> was created on February 14, 2026. Both are registered to the Respondent Tod Guard, listing an obviously fictitious postal address (the street address is given as “Ffsdybbbc”) in Israel, with a Gmail contact email address. The postal code also appears to be fictitious, as it is composed of an ascending sequence of numbers (4456789), and the Panel notes that these do not correspond to any of the postal codes assigned to the given city in Israel, according to online postal records.¹

At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name <rothschildprivefinance.com> resolves to a landing page headed with an “RPF” logo and the name ROTHSCCHILD PRIVÉ FINANCE (“privé” being French for “private”), above the message, “This platform is currently under development and presented as a conceptual

¹ Noting the general powers of a panel articulated in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, it is commonly accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record, as the Panel has done in these proceedings. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 4.8.

advisory project". However, it also presents a space to enter "Log In" information and a "Remember Me" button.

The Complaint attaches a screenshot of the website to which the disputed domain name <rothschildprivfinance.com> formerly resolved (the "Respondent's former first website"). The home page displayed a picture of a credit card beside the tagline, "Choice for Your Banking Needs", followed by the text, "Our Orange Card is the best option if you are looking for high-quality and reliable banking services".

The disputed domain name <rothschildidentiy.com> resolves to a website (the "Respondent's second website") headed "Rothschild Identity" with the tagline, "Exploring Identity & Strategy Across Borders", (and at the time of the filing of the Complaint: "Digital Identity & Brand Reputation Advisory") followed by this text:

"A conceptual platform developed by Solli Rothschild, focused on digital identity and positioning."

The Respondent's second website site explains that it was created "to explore the growing complexity of digital identity and name-based branding in the modern online economy" and claims that "our services are particularly relevant for individuals whose names carry reputational weight and require structured digital positioning". The site offers digital identity, brand reputation management, reputation assessment, reputation assessment, "narrative strategy", and tailored "private advisory" services. Internet users are invited to furnish their email addresses or contact the website operator by telephone (the phone number has a non-functional country code), but no postal address is given on the website. The website pages include a footer with the following disclaimer:

"This platform is independently developed by Solli Rothschild and is not affiliated with any financial institution or organization sharing the Rothschild name."

The Archives on the Respondent's second website includes December 24, 2025, blog posts describing Solli Rothschild's "Selective Model for International Private Financial Platforms" on an invitation-only basis, mentioning the Rothschild Privé Finance platform as providing "financial and lifestyle services" and "premium debit and credit card solutions". (Blog posts also mention Solli Rothschild's other ventures such as the Rothschild Beauty Club and LuxuryEuropeanOutlet.com, as well as her activities as a digital creator.)

The Complainant observes that a website at "www.sollirothschild.com" (the "Solli Rothschild website") is operated by a person who gives her name as "Solli Rothschild" and describes herself as "Founder of Independent Platforms Across Advisory, Identity, Reputation, and Luxury Sectors", specifically mentioning "Rothschild Privé Finance" and "Rothschild Identity". A press release on the Solli Rothschild Website states that the "Rothschild Privé Finance" platform "provides premium banking services, VIP debit and credit cards, and curated benefits for a selective global clientele". The Solli Rothschild website includes a contact form and lists a media office in Oslo, Norway. The site also has a disclaimer of affiliation with "any similarly named institutions or legacy entities".

The Complainant, through its representative Ebrand, contacted the Respondent in January 2026 raising trademark concerns. The email correspondence is attached to the Complaint. The Complainant questioned the use of the Rothschild name and certain material that appeared at that time on the Respondent's former first website, referring to Rothschild Privé Finance as an institution that had been in existence since 1999, issuing tens of thousands of credit cards, with an address given alternatively in London, United Kingdom or in the United States of America ("United States"). The Respondent stated that the site was merely under development by third parties and not finalized. The Respondent pointed to the Solli Rothschild website, published materials, and "an ongoing digital presence" to establish the existence of Solli Rothschild as an entrepreneur with the surname Rothschild. The Respondent denied being involved in banking activities and modified the content on the Respondent's first website to the landing page described above. Subsequently, however, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name <rothschildidentity.com>. The associated Respondent's second website publishes the December 2025 blog posts mentioned above describing the financial and credit card services of Rothschild Privé Finance.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that both of the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's registered ROTHSCILD or ROTHSCILD & CO marks.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, because (a) it does not have permission to use the Complainant's marks, (b) there is no evidence that it is commonly known by the disputed domain names, (c) there is no credible evidence that the Respondent is connected to a person with the surname "Rothschild" or legitimately using that name in the disputed domain names suggesting a connection with financial or advisory services, (d) there is no evidence of use or demonstrable preparation to use the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, as the associated websites do not refer to verifiable companies, addresses, services, or clients, and (e) any such use would not be fair use because it would be trading on the Complainant's reputation in financial services.

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain names were registered and used in bad faith, in an effort to create confusion with the Complainant's well-known marks for commercial gain, and possibly also to facilitate a phishing scam. The Complainant points to indicia of fraud and deception such as false registration details and false content on the Respondent's former first website and the news release on the Solli Rothschild website, in conflict with the Respondent's representations to the Complainant that the Respondent was not engaged in banking activities.

B. Respondent

A person using the Respondent's contact email address and signing emails as "Nate" (hereafter referred to as the "Respondent") sent an email to the Center denying bad faith and saying that "we" are available for settlement discussions. The Center provided information about settlement procedures, which the Parties did not pursue. The Respondent subsequently submitted a brief Response stating, substantively:

"The disputed domain names were registered and are being used in good faith, based on a legitimate personal surname and for independently developed projects. At no time has there been any intention to impersonate, mislead, or create confusion with the Complainant or any affiliated entity. The Respondent's platforms are positioned independently, do not reference or replicate the Complainant's branding, and operate within a distinct conceptual and operational framework."

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 (the registered ROTHSCILD and ROTHSCILD & CO word marks) for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the ROTHSCILD mark and the distinctive portion of the ROTHSCILD & CO mark are reproduced within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are 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, “identity”, “prive” [French for “private” but lacking the accent mark], and “finance”) 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 the 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 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise. The disputed domain names were registered by a “Tod Guard”, giving patently false postal address details. The Respondent offers no information about the identity of “Tod Guard” or that person’s connection with the person named “Solli Rothschild”, on whose behalf a very minimal Response was submitted, by an individual named “Nate” who also does not explain his connection to Solli Rothschild. The Respondent’s former first website, associated with the disputed domain name <rothschildprivefinance.com>, touted a banking and credit card business supposedly in operation since 1999, based either in the United Kingdom or the United States. In correspondence with the Complainant’s representative, the Respondent quickly denied such an operation and replaced the website with an “under development” landing page, and yet the Respondent’s second website, associated with the disputed domain name <rothschildidentity.com>, still refers to it, as does the Solli Rothschild website. None of these websites names a verifiable company entity or gives evidence of actual business operations conducted for either the Rothschild Privé Finance or the Rothschild Identity enterprises, or demonstrable preparations to do so, and the Respondent has not offered supporting evidence with the Response. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.2.

Panels also have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity, here claimed to be phishing for personal information by soliciting contact details for purported financial services or fraudulently emulating the Complainant’s financial services, 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

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) is apt in the circumstances of this proceeding: the attempt to attract Internet users to a site for commercial gain by creating confusion with the Complainant’s mark. The Complainant’s marks in this case are globally well established (the Respondent does not deny awareness of them), and the Respondent used relevant terms in

the disputed domain names as well as content in the associated websites suggestive of financial and advisory services for which the Complainant is celebrated. The Panel notes that this is more obviously true of the composition of the earlier disputed domain name, <rothschildprivefinance.com>, but both disputed domain names were used for content that referred to financial and advisory services, and both included the well-known ROTHSCHILD mark in its entirety.

As discussed in the preceding section, there are compelling indicia of deception supporting an inference of bad faith: the Respondent furnished false registration details and has never properly identified himself or herself or established his or her connection with the individual claiming the Rothschild surname; the Respondent's former first website made improbable claims of operating as an English or American bank and credit card issuer while never identifying itself as a verifiable entity; each of the websites associated with the Respondent collects personal contact details while offering little verifiable information about its operator. The disclaimers on the Respondent's websites do not cure these defects.

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 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.

Panels also have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activity, here claimed to be phishing for personal information by soliciting contact details for purported financial services or fraudulently emulating the Complainant's financial services, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitute bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has 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 names <rothschildidentity.com> and <rothschildprivefinance.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/W. Scott Blackmer/

W. Scott Blackmer

Sole Panelist

Date: May 22, 2026