

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lennar Pacific Properties Management, LLC and Lennar Corporation v.
Regent Logan
Case No. D2026-1678

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Lennar Pacific Properties Management, LLC and Lennar Corporation, both of United States of America (“United States” or “U.S.”), represented by Slates Harwell Campbell, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Regent Logan, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lennarscorp.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 20, 2026. On April 22, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 22, 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 (The RDAP server redacted the value, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on April 22, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amendment to the Complaint on April 22, 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 13, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 15, 2026.

The Center appointed Kathryn Lee as the sole panelist in this matter on May 22, 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 Complainants are Lennar Pacific Properties Management, LLC, the trademark owner of the LENNAR mark (U.S. Trademark Registration Numbers 3,108,401 and 3,477,143, registered on June 27, 2006, and July 29, 2008, respectively), and Lennar Corporation, a homebuilder which develops, builds, and sells homes under the LENNAR mark and authorized licensee of the LENNAR mark (collectively the "Complainant"). The LENNAR mark has been used in connection with real estate management, brokerage, development, construction, mortgage, and financial services since 1973. The Complainant has been operating the domain name <lennar.com>.

The Respondent appears to be an individual or an entity with an address in the United States.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 10, 2026, and does not resolve to any website with active content.

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 identical or confusingly similar to the LENNAR mark in which it has registrations.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and confirms that it has not authorized or licensed rights to the Respondent in any respect. The Complainant further contends that there is no evidence of the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name in providing any bona fide offering of goods or services, nor any evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent. In addition, the Complainant contends that it sent a cease and desist letter to the Respondent on March 12, 2026, regarding the disputed domain name, and the Respondent failed to respond or to provide any explanation for registering the disputed domain name.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith based on the distinctiveness and reputation of the LENNAR mark, the Respondent's concealment of its identity and non-use of the disputed domain name, and the Respondent's failure to respond to the Complainant's cease and desist letter. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent's non-use of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

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, the term “scorp” – 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.

Moreover, prior UDRP panels have found that domain names identical to a complainant's trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation. Even where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term, UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. Here, the term “scorp” is added after the LENNAR mark which may be viewed as the term “corp” and mislead Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name is associated with the Complainant companies, contrary to the fact, or even with the second Complainant Lennar Corporation more directly. As for the letter “s”, it may be dismissed from consideration at first glance by an Internet user.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark. Based on the confusing similarity of the disputed domain name to the Complainant's mark, as well as the distinctiveness of the Complainant's mark, it is likely that the Respondent targeted the Complainant in registering the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent likely did so in order to sell it to the Complainant at a profit, or to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark in some manner. It is highly improbable that the disputed domain name was registered in good faith and without knowledge of the Complainant's trademark.

The Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain name, the failure of the Respondent to submit a response to the Complaint, the Respondent's concealing its identity and use of false contact details, and the implausibility of any good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of 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 name <lennarscorp.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kathryn Lee/

Kathryn Lee

Sole Panelist

Date: June 2, 2026