

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LegalZoom.com, Inc. v. Privacy Department, IceNetworks Ltd.
Case No. D2026-1465

1. The Parties

The Complainant is LegalZoom.com, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Bryan Cave Leighton Paisner LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Privacy Department, IceNetworks Ltd., Iceland.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <legalzoomip.com> is registered with Internet Domain Service BS Corp (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 7, 2026. On April 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 8, 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 (Domain Admin, Whois Privacy Corp) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 8, 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 13, 2026, and an amendment to the Complaint on April 14, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint and 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 6, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Pablo A. Palazzi 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 an American online legal technology and services company launched in 2001, providing online legal services through an independent network of attorneys, its own law firm LegalZoom Legal Services, self-service technology, and care specialists. The Complainant specializes in providing accessible legal document creation services, including trademark registration, business formation, estate planning, and copyright documentation. Furthermore, the Complainant enjoys significant commercial success and public recognition, being a NASDAQ-listed entity trading under the ticker LZ.

The Complainant holds numerous registrations for its LEGALZOOM trademarks in the United States and around the world, for example:

- LEGALZOOM (word) (United States Registration No. 3,210,861) registered on February 20, 2007, for “attorney referral services” in International class 35;
- LEGALZOOM (word) (United States Registration No. 3,210,728) registered on February 20, 2007, for “legal document preparation services and providing general legal information via a website on global computer” in International class 42;
- LEGALZOOM.COM (word) (United States Registration No. 3,569,400) registered on February 3, 2009, for “providing online directory information on attorney listings and attorney referral and matching services” in International class 35, and for “legal services; legal document preparation services and providing general legal information via a website on global computer networks” in international class 45; and
- LEGALZOOM.COM (figurative) (United States Registration No. 3,748,170) registered on February 16, 2010, for “providing online directory information on attorney listings and attorney referral and matching services” in International class 35, and for “legal services; legal document preparation services and providing general legal information via a website on global computer networks” in International class 45.

The Complainant has maintained an active presence on the Internet, including through its official website <legalzoom.com> since 2001, where it offers an extensive suite of legal and business support services, including intellectual property registration and protection, business entity formation and registration, online legal document services, attorney listings, electronic signature services, virtual mail services, tax and accounting services, compliance services, registered agent services, and other general legal services and information to small businesses and individual consumers.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 25, 2026. The disputed domain name resolves to a website where legal services mainly related to intellectual property are offered. The website displays a logo that is virtually identical to the Complainant’s logo with the additional term “ip”, incorporates the Complainant’s orange color scheme, and mimics the design of the Complainant’s website.

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.

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 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 "ip" (an abbreviation for "intellectual property") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term 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.

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 finds the composition of the disputed domain name, comprising the Complainant's trademark LEGALZOOM in its entirety and the addition of the term "ip" (an abbreviation for "intellectual property" and is closely related to the Complainant's services), creates a risk of Internet user confusion. Such confusion has been reinforced by the fact that the website at the disputed domain name displays a logo that is virtually identical to the Complainant's logo with the additional term "ip", incorporates the Complainant's orange color scheme, and mimics the design of the Complainant's website.

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.

The Panel notes the following:

- The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on February 25, 2026, while the Complainant has been using the LEGALZOOM marks since 2001.
- A side-by-side examination of the website at the disputed domain name <legalzoomip.com> and the Complainant's official website at "www.legalzoom.com" reveals a pattern of deliberate imitation calculated to mislead consumers.
- The overall commercial impression conveyed by the disputed domain name and the website to which it resolves is that of an authorized or affiliated branch of the Complainant mainly dedicated to intellectual property matters, a false impression that the Panel finds constitutes bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.
- The website at the disputed domain name has a fine print of disclaimer at the bottom of its home page. Given the nature of the disputed domain name, the use of the Complainant's logo and orange color scheme on the website, and similarities between the websites at the disputed domain name and the Complainant's, the Panel finds the mere existence of a disclaimer cannot cure the Respondent's bad faith under the circumstances of this case.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning 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 name <legalzoomip.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Pablo A. Palazzi/

Pablo A. Palazzi

Sole Panelist

Date: May 29, 2026