

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Forbes LLC v. NA NA, NA
Case No. D2026-1674

1. The Parties

Complainant is Forbes LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Riker Danzig LLP, United States.

Respondent is NA NA, NA, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <forbesca.com> (the "Domain Name") is registered with Web Commerce Communications Limited dba WebNic.cc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 20, 2026. On April 21, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On April 22, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on April 22, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on April 23, 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 April 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 14, 2026. Respondent sent email communications to the Center on May 15, 2026 and May 19, 2026. Response due date was extended to May 18, 2026 upon Respondent's request.

The Center appointed Kimberley Chen Nobles as the sole panelist in this matter on May 29, 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

Complainant is a limited liability company organized under the laws of the State of Delaware, United States, and the successor-in-interest to Forbes Inc., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of New York, United States. Complainant and its affiliates are in the businesses of publishing, investment, financial and business fields.

Since 1917, Complainant has published FORBES magazine, a bi-monthly business magazine with a United States and worldwide circulation. Complainant has also published and continues to publish a number of other print magazines with the Forbes brand and name. In 1997, Complainant expanded into electronic commerce and information delivery services through its Internet website, "forbes.com", which provides online publications, webcasts, market updates, newsletters, virtual events, an e-commerce platform, video and information regarding a wide variety of subject matters, such as breaking news, finance, investing, economics, politics, entertainment, and travel and leisure. Through its "forbes.com" website, Complainant also provides online versions of its print publications such as FORBES, FORBESLIFE, and FORBES MEXICO.

Complainant owns numerous registered trademarks in jurisdictions worldwide, including:

- United States registered trademark number 1141299 for the FORBES word mark, registered on November 11, 1980;
- United States registered trademark number 1919483 for the FORBES word mark, registered on September 19, 1995; and
- Canadian registered trademark number 643355 for the FORBES word mark, registered on March 12, 1993.

The Domain Name was registered on July 16, 2024 and redirects to a website that features online news articles relating to business, technology, real estate, the economy, investments, lifestyle, and general news, (which is in the same industry and business as 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 Name.

Notably, Complainant contends that (i) the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark; (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

In particular, Complainant contends that it has trademark registrations and rights for FORBES and that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name, with the intention to confuse Internet users looking for Complainant's bona fide and well-known services.

Complainant notes that it has no affiliation with Respondent, nor authorized Respondent to register or use a domain name which includes Complainant's trademark, and that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the registration and use of the Domain Name. Rather, Complainant contends that Respondent has acted in bad faith in acquiring and setting up the Domain Name, when Respondent clearly knew of Complainant's rights. Specifically, Complainant argues that Respondent used the Domain Name to create a false association with Complainant, so as to deceive Internet users into believing that its website is operated by or associated with Complainant.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not submit a official Response. However, Respondent sent email communications to the Center on May 15, 2026 which was granted and again May 19, 2026 requesting an extension to submit a Response which was left to the Panel to determine. The Panel determines not to accept the second requested extension.

6. Discussion and Findings

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

- (i) the Domain Name is 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 Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Section 4.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) states that failure to respond to 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 FORBES trademark, as noted above. Complainant has therefore proven that it has the requisite rights in the FORBES trademarks.

With Complainant's rights in the FORBES trademark established, the remaining question under the first element of the Policy is whether the Domain Name, typically disregarding the Top-Level Domain in which it was registered (in this case, ".com"), is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark.

Here, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant's FORBES trademark. The FORBES trademark is recognizable in the Domain Name. The addition of the term "CA" (generally known to be an abbreviation for the country, Canada) after Complainant's FORBES trademark in the Domain Name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the FORBES trademark. See section 1.8 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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), Section 2.1. 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 FORBES trademark and does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Complainant has confirmed that Respondent is not affiliated with Complainant, or otherwise authorized or licensed to use the FORBES trademark or to seek registration of any domain name incorporating this trademark. Respondent is also not known to be associated with the FORBES trademark and there is no evidence showing that Respondent has been commonly known by the Domain Name.

In addition, Respondent has not used the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Rather, the record shows that the Domain Name redirects to a website that features online news articles relating to business, technology, real estate, the economy, investments, lifestyle, and general news, which is in the same field of business as Complainant. The website not only uses Complainant's trademarks in the Domain Name, but also features content with the look and feel of Complainant's legitimate online publication. Additionally, the record shows that Respondent appears to be using the Instagram handle "@Forbes_Canada", to promote the website available at the Domain Name.

Complainant noted that it has no affiliation with Respondent, noting that the Domain Name, by including the letters "CA" – which is generally known to be an abbreviation of the country, Canada, suggests a legitimate affiliation with Complainant as its Canadian licensee or affiliate.

UDRP panels have consistently held that use of a domain name for impersonation or passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Accordingly, Complainant has provided evidence supporting its prima facie showing that Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Respondent has failed to produce countervailing evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Thus, the Panel concludes that Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name 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 Name 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:

"(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 FORBES trademark predate the registration of the Domain Name. Complainant is also well established and known; indeed, the record shows that Complainant's FORBES trademark and related products and services are known and recognized for purposes of the Policy. Therefore, and also noting the use analysis below, Respondent was clearly aware of the FORBES trademark when it registered the Domain Name.

The Panel therefore finds that Respondent's awareness of Complainant's trademark rights at the time of registration suggests bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), Section 3.2.2.

Moreover, Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name to confuse and mislead consumers looking for bona fide and well-known FORBES products and services of Complainant's. In particular, the record shows that the Domain Name redirects to a website that features online news articles relating to business, technology, real estate, the economy, investments, lifestyle, and general news, which is in the same field of business as Complainant, and not only uses Complainant's trademarks in the Domain Name, but also features content with the look and feel of Complainant's well-known online publication. Additionally, Respondent appears to be using the Instagram handle "@Forbes_Canada", to promote the website available at the Domain Name.

Complainant noted that it has no affiliation with Respondent, noting that the Domain Name, by including the letters "CA" – which is generally known to be an abbreviation of the country, Canada, suggests a legitimate affiliation with Complainant (which does not in fact exist) as its Canadian licensee or affiliate.

Therefore, by using the Domain Name featuring Complainant's trademarks, and then further to promote the Respondent's own products using content with a similar look and feel of Complainant's website, as shown by evidence in the record – to attract members of the public to the website associated with the Domain Name, Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's FORBES marks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondent's website.

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.

Finally, the Panel also notes the failure of Respondent to submit a response, despite asking for an extension to do so, which may be further evidence of Respondent's bad faith and an attempt to prolong the bad faith conduct. In the present circumstances, considering the reputation of the FORBES trademark, and the use of the Domain Name, the Panel finds that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name 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 Name <forbesca.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Kimberley Chen Nobles/

Kimberley Chen Nobles

Sole Panelist

Date: June 11, 2026