

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Cantor Fitzgerald Securities v. Name Redacted, Name Redacted, and Elizabeth Collins
Case No. D2026-1631

1. The Parties

Complainant is Cantor Fitzgerald Securities, United States of America (the “United States” or “U.S.”), represented by Akerman LLP, United States.

Respondents are Name Redacted, Name Redacted,¹ and Elizabeth Collins, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <cantorfitzgeraldco.com> (“Domain Name 1”), <cantorfitzgeraldlp.com> (“Domain Name 2”), and <cantorfitzgeralds.info> (“Domain Name 3”) (collectively, the “Domain Names”) are registered with Wild West Domains, LLC, Squarespace Domains II LLC, and NameSilo, LLC respectively (collectively the “Registrars”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 16, 2026. On April 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars requests for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Names. On April 17 and 24, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses, disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Names which differed from the named Respondent (REGISTRATION PRIVATE / DOMAINS BY PROXY LLC / REDACTED) and contact information in the Complaint.

¹ Respondents appear to have used the name of an unrelated individual when registering the Domain Names. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted these Respondents’ names from this Decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this Decision an instruction to the Registrars regarding transfer of the Domain Names, which includes the name of Respondents. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrars as part of the order in this proceeding, and has indicated Annex 1 to this Decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case.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](#).

The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on April 23 and 24, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the Domain Names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all Domain Names are under common control. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on April 23, 2026 and amended Complaint on April 29, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint and 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 25, 2026. Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondents' default on May 26, 2026.

The Center appointed Kimberley Chen Nobles as the sole panelist in this matter on June 3, 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

Formed over 75 years ago, Complainant provides financial services, including, broker-dealer, domestic and international equities, fixed income and currencies, real estate, and investment banking services. Complainant is known for its securities work, including credit securities, asset-backed and mortgage-backed securities, and emerging market credit securities. With over 1800 employees, Complainant serves over 5000 institutional clients in 35 global locations.

Complainant owns numerous registered trademarks for the CANTOR and CANTOR FITZGERALD marks in various jurisdictions, including:

- United States registered trademark number 2682690 for the CANTOR word mark, registered on February 4, 2003;
- United States registered trademark number 4930552 for the CANTOR word mark, registered on April 5, 2016;
- United States registered trademark number 3170687 for the CANTOR word and design mark, registered on November 14, 2006;
- United States registered trademark number 2682691 for the CANTOR FITZGERALD word mark, registered on February 4, 2003;
- Canadian registered trademark number TMA637401 for the CANTOR FITZGERALD word mark, registered on April 14, 2005; and
- United Kingdom registered trademark number UK00903283041 for the CANTOR FITZGERALD word mark, registered February 1, 2005.

Complainant also owns the domain name <cantor.com> and has used it since 1988 in connection with Complainant's financial services. Complainant also owns and uses the domain name <cantorfitzgerald.com> in connection with information regarding Complainant.

The Domain Names were all registered on April 10, 2026. Domain Name 1 was configured with email capabilities and used to facilitate the sending of emails to investment firms to set up meetings, which were passed off as originating from Complainant's employee, in an attempt to fraudulently contact targeted investment firms. Domain Names 1 and 2 were registered using the name of one of Complainant's employees and thereafter, email capabilities were set up, and in the case of Domain Name 2 - to include an email address that impersonates the same employee. The third Domain Name resolves to a webpage with click through links, a number of which are for financial services unrelated to Complainant.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Names.

Notably, Complainant contends that (i) the Domain Names are confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark; (ii) Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names; and (iii) Respondents registered and are using the Domain Names in bad faith.

In particular, Complainant contends that it has trademark registrations and rights for CANTOR and CANTOR FITZGERALD and that Respondents registered and are using the Domain Names with the intention to confuse Internet users looking for bona fide and well-known CANTOR and CANTOR FITZGERALD services, as part of a fraudulent scheme.

Complainant notes that it has no affiliation with Respondents, nor authorized Respondents to register or use domain names which includes Complainant's trademark, and that Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the registration and use of the Domain Names. Rather, Complainant contends that Respondents have acted in bad faith in acquiring and setting up the Domain Names, when Respondents clearly knew of Complainant's rights. Specifically, Complainant argues that Respondents: (1) set up Domain Name 1 configured to facilitate the sending of emails to third party investment firms to set up meetings, passing off the emails as originating from Complainant's employee, in an attempt to fraudulently contact targeted investment firms; (2) used a Complainant's employee's name to register Domain Names 1 and 2 and thereafter, email capabilities were set up, and in the case of Domain Name 2 - provided in the registration details an email address that impersonates the same employee; (3) set up the third Domain Name 3 which resolves to a webpage with click through links ("Pay Per Click" or "PPC"), a number of which are for financial services unrelated to Complainant.

B. Respondents

Respondents did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control, for the following reasons:

All three Domain Names were registered on the same day, all are based on Complainant's CANTOR FITZGERALD mark and follow the same pattern of adding one or two letters at the end of the mark to form the respective Domain Name, and all use United States based registrars. Domain Names 1 and 2 both used the name of one of Complainant's employees as the registrant's name, have been set up for email use and in the case of Domain Name 1 - has been deployed to impersonate employees of Complainant. Domain Name 3 resolves to a page with PCC links and each Domain Name uses what appears to be a false address. Complainant further submits that the party or entity who registered the three Domain Names also attempted to mask the deployment of the fraudulent scheme implemented.

Complainant further contends that the combination of the above factors justifies the filing of a single Complaint for the three Domain Names, and requests the consolidation of the disputes against the multiple Domain Name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The Domain Name registrants did not comment on Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the Domain Names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.11.2.

Panels have considered a range of factors, typically present in some combination, as useful to determining whether such consolidation is appropriate, such as similarities in or relevant aspects of (i) the registrants' identity(ies) including pseudonyms, (ii) the registrants' contact information including email address(es), postal address(es), or phone number(s), including any pattern of irregularities, (iii) relevant IP addresses, name servers, or webhost(s), (iv) the content or layout of websites corresponding to the disputed domain names, (v) the nature of the marks at issue (e.g., where a registrant targets a specific sector), (vi) any naming patterns in the disputed domain names (e.g., <mark-country> or <mark-goods>), (vii) the relevant language/scripts of the disputed domain names particularly where they are the same as the mark(s) at issue, (viii) any changes by the respondent relating to any of the above items following communications regarding the disputed domain name(s), (ix) any evidence of respondent affiliation with respect to the ability to control the disputed domain name(s), (x) any (prior) pattern of similar respondent behavior, or (xi) other arguments made by the complainant and/or disclosures by the respondent(s).

As regards to common control, the Panel notes the exact date of registration of all three Domain Names, the highly similar composition of the Domain Names, the use of Complainant's employee name to register Domain Names 1 and 2, the use of emails in the case of Domain Name 1 and in a fraudulent scheme, and the similarities in providing false contact information for Respondents.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different Domain Name registrants (referred to below as "Respondent") in a single proceeding.

6.2 Substantive Issues – Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the Domain Names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Names; and

(iii) the Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

Section 4.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) states that failure to respond to the complainant's contentions would not by itself mean that the complainant is deemed to have prevailed; a respondent's default is not necessarily an admission that the complainant's claims are true.

Thus, although in this case Respondent has failed to respond to the Complaint, the burden remains with Complainant to establish the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy by a preponderance of the evidence.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Complainant has provided evidence of its rights in the CANTOR and CANTOR FITZGERALD trademarks, as noted above. Complainant has therefore proven that it has the requisite rights in the CANTOR and CANTOR FITZGERALD trademarks.

With Complainant's rights in the CANTOR and CANTOR FITZGERALD trademarks established, the remaining question under the first element of the Policy is whether the Domain Names, typically disregarding the Top-Level Domain ("TLD") in which they were registered (in this case, ".com" and ".info"), are identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks. See, e.g., *B & H Foto & Electronics Corp. v. Domains by Proxy, Inc. / Joseph Gross*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-0842](#).

Here, the Domain Names are confusingly similar to Complainant's CANTOR and/or CANTOR FITZGERALD trademarks. The CANTOR and/or CANTOR FITZGERALD trademarks are recognizable in the Domain Names.

In particular, CANTOR trademark is recognizable on its own, separate and apart from the CANTOR FITZGERALD trademarks, in the Domain Name.

With regards to Complainant's CANTOR FITZGERALD trademarks, the absence of a space between "CANTOR" and "FITZGERALD" in each of the Domain Names, and the addition of the letters "co" after "cantorfitzgerald" in Domain Name 1; the addition of the letters "lp" after "cantorfitzgerald" in Domain Name 2 and the addition of the letter "s" after "cantorfitzgerald" in Domain Name 3, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Names and the CANTOR FITZGERALD trademarks. See section 1.9 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#)

Thus, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied the first element of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, a complainant must make a prima facie showing that a respondent possesses no rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. See, e.g., *Malayan Banking Berhad v. Beauty, Success & Truth International*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-1393](#). Once a complainant makes such a prima facie showing, the burden of production shifts to the respondent, though the burden of proof always remains on the complainant. If the respondent fails to come forward with relevant evidence showing rights or legitimate interests, the complainant will have sustained its burden under the second element of the UDRP.

From the record in this case, it is evident that Respondent was, and is, aware of Complainant and its CANTOR FITZGERALD trademarks and does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. Complainant has confirmed that Respondent is not affiliated with Complainant, or otherwise authorized or licensed to use the CANTOR FITZGERALD trademarks or to seek registration of any domain name incorporating these trademarks. Respondent is also not known to be associated with the CANTOR FITZGERALD trademarks and there is no evidence showing that Respondent has been commonly known by the Domain Names.

In addition, Respondent has not used the Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Rather, the record shows that Respondent had (1) set up Domain Name 1 configured to facilitate the sending of emails, and actually used it to send emails to third party investment firms to set up meetings, passing them off as originating from Complainant's employee, in an attempt to fraudulently contact targeted investment firms; (2) used a Complainant's employee's name to register Domain Names 1 and 2 and thereafter, email capabilities were set up, and in the case of Domain Name 2 – provided in the registration details an email address that impersonates the same employee; (3) set up the third Domain Name 3 which resolves to a webpage with click through links, a number of which are for financial services unrelated to Complainant.

With regards to Domain Name 1, UDRP panels have consistently held that use of a domain name for illegal activity - such as email phishing, impersonation, or passing off - can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

In addition, Respondent has not used Domain Name 3 in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Rather, at the time of the filing of the Complaint, the Domain Name resolved to a website with a PPC or monetized parking page that included links for various financial services such as "Institutional Bond Trading And Research", "Invest In SpaceX Pre Ipo" and "2026 Lowes Stock Split" - which are in the field of Complainant's business - while prominently displaying the banner "cantorfitzgeralds.info".

Such use by Respondent does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use and cannot under the circumstances confer on Respondent any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name 3.

Moreover, the nature of the Domain Name 3, incorporating the entirety of Complainant's trademark CANTOR FITZGERALD, particularly in conjunction with the PPC links and banners noted above, indicates Respondent's intent to capitalize on Complainant's trademark, and thus, does not support a finding of rights or legitimate interests.

Furthermore, Respondent used a proxy service or selected a registrar with default proxy services to mask its identity, and Respondent has used a name of a Complainant's employee and seemingly false underlying contact information to register the Domain Names. The Panel finds that such use of a false name and contact information, in particular of Complainant's employee's name in the case of Domain Names 1 and 2, and further in the case of Domain Name 2 – providing in the registration details an email address that impersonates the same employee - does not confer rights or legitimate interests on Respondent.²

Accordingly, Complainant has provided evidence supporting its prima facie showing that Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. Respondent has failed to produce countervailing evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. Thus, the Panel concludes that Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names and Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that Respondent's actions indicate that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Names in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances indicating bad faith registration and use on the part of a respondent, namely:

² Complainant verified that its employee was not involved in registering the Domain Names 1 and 2 and has no knowledge regarding the registration since there is no connection between the employee and the contact information that Respondent used to register the Domain Name. Thus, the Panel concludes that the employee was the subject of a potential identity theft.

“(i) circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) you have registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, you 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 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 Panel finds that Complainant has provided ample evidence to show that registration and use of the CANTOR FITZGERALD trademarks long predate the registration of the Domain Names. Complainant is also well established and known; indeed, the record shows that Complainant’s CANTOR FITZGERALD trademark and related services are widely known and recognized for purposes of the Policy. Therefore, on the balance of probabilities, and also noting the use analysis below, Respondent was clearly aware of the CANTOR FITZGERALD trademark when it registered the Domain Names.

The Panel therefore finds that Respondent’s awareness of Complainant’s trademark rights at the time of registration suggests bad faith. See *Red Bull GmbH v. Credit du Léman SA, Jean-Denis Deletraz*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-2209](#); *Nintendo of America Inc v. Marco Beijen, Beijen Consulting, Pokemon Fan Clubs Org., and Pokemon Fans Unite*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-1070](#); and *BellSouth Intellectual Property Corporation v. Serena, Axel*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0007](#).

Moreover, the Domain Names’ inclusion of Complainant’s CANTOR FITZGERALD trademarks in their entirety, addition of the letters as discussed above, and the use to which the Domain Names 1 and 3 have been put, further suggests Respondent’s actual knowledge of Complainant’s rights in the CANTOR FITZGERALD trademarks at the time of registration of the Domain Name, and its effort to opportunistically capitalize on Complainant’s trademarks through the registration and use of the Domain Names.

Further, such adoption of Complainant’s trademarks, particularly with regards to Domain Name 1, at the time of registration of the Domain Name is a common tactic for phishing schemes, where individuals seek to pass themselves off as prominent companies or firms in the hopes of seeking business, confidential information and ultimately, defrauding current or potential clients of those companies or firms. See, e.g., *Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher, LLP v. Jason Leonardo*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2989](#); *Latham & Watkins LLP v. Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-2877](#); *Ropes & Gray LLP v. matthew rolland, ropes gray*, WIPO Case No. [D2023 0288](#).

As noted above, the record shows that Respondent had (1) set up Domain Name 1 configured to facilitate the sending of emails, and actually used it to send emails to third party investment firms to set up meetings, passing them off as originating from Complainant’s employee, in an attempt to fraudulently contact targeted investment firms; (2) used a Complainant’s employee’s name to register Domain Names 1 and 2 and thereafter, email capabilities were set up, and in the case of Domain Name 2 – provided in the registration details an email address that impersonates the same employee; (3) set up the third Domain Name 3 which resolves to a webpage with click through links, a number of which are for financial services unrelated to Complainant.

UDRP panels have consistently held that a respondent's use of a domain name to trade off goodwill in a complainant's well-known trademark and impersonate complainant, as here, constitutes bad faith. Moreover, such use of the Domain Name may potentially result in tarnishing Complainant's reputation and goodwill.

With regards to Domain Name 3, Respondent is using it to host with a PPC or monetized parking page that includes links for various services that are in the field of Complainant's services. The Panel finds that Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's CANTOR FITZGERLAD marks.

Finally, the Panel also notes the failure of Respondent to submit a response, Respondent's use of a proxy service or selection of a registrar with default proxy services to mask its identity, and Respondent's use of Complainant's employee name and false underlying contact information to register the Domain Names. The Panel thus considers such factors as strong further evidence of Respondent's registration and use in bad faith.

In the present circumstances, considering the reputation of the CANTOR FITZGERALD trademarks, and the fraudulent use of the Domain Name 1 and the factors discussed above, the Panel finds that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Names in bad faith.

Therefore, the Panel finds that Complainant succeeds under 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 Domain Names <cantorfitzgeraldco.com>, <cantorfitzgeraldlp.com> and <cantorfitzgeralds.info> be transferred to Complainant.

/Kimberley Chen Nobles/

Kimberley Chen Nobles

Sole Panelist

Date: June 11, 2026