

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Brixmor Property Group, Inc. v. Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC
Case No. D2026-1947

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Brixmor Property Group, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Neal, Gerber & Eisenberg LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC, Saint Kitts and Nevis.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <brixmorsso.com>, <mybrixmorsfso.com>, and <mybrixmorsso.com> are registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 4, 2026 regarding the disputed domain names and another domain name. On May 6, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar and another registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names and another domain name. On the same date, the Registrar and another registrar transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names and another domain name which differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on the same date with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar and another registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names and another domain name 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. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on May 11, 2026, with a request to remove another domain name.

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 May 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 7, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Willem J. H. Leppink as the sole panelist in this matter on June 16, 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 following facts are undisputed.

The Complainant is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware with its principal office in the State of New York. The Complainant is known for operating shopping and retail facilities. The Complainant regularly partners with localities to upgrade aging infrastructure and provide licensing opportunities to small and large businesses.

The Complainant has obtained multiple trademark registrations for marks that consist of or include the term "Brixmor", in the United States, including the United States Trademark Registration No. 4,269,899 for the word mark BRIXMOR, registered on January 1, 2013 for real estate related services in classes 36 and 37.

The Complainant operates its main website at "www.brixmor.com".

The disputed domain names were registered on the following dates: <brixmorsso.com> on December 22, 2025, <mybrixmorsfso.com> on December 28, 2025, and <mybrixmorsso.com> on December 27, 2025.

At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain names <mybrixmorsfso.com> and <mybrixmorsso.com> did not resolve to any active website while the disputed domain name <brixmorsso.com> resolved to a website with a warning message "[t]his site has been reported as unsafe".

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 the following:

The Complainant has invested enormous time, effort and resources in promoting and marketing its services under and in connection with the BRIXMOR marks. As a result of this extensive use and promotion of the BRIXMOR marks, these have developed considerable consumer recognition and have become known and recognized by travelers all over the world as identifying and distinguishing the Complainant and its services.

The Complainant's services have further garnered media attention and critical acclaim in international publications such as "Forbes, Barron's, CNBC, the Chicago Tribune, Investors' Business Daily, and Simply Wall Street".

The Respondent undoubtedly registered the disputed domain names in order to trade upon the significant goodwill and extensive promotional efforts associated with the BRIXMOR marks. Not coincidentally, the disputed domain names are primarily comprised of the Complainant's name and its trademark, and the addition of the terms "my", "sso", or misspelling of the term "sso", which is an acronym for "single sign-on", and is included to impersonate the Complainant and deceive unsuspecting users that communications from the disputed domain names are part of the Complainant's authentication process.

The disputed domain name <brixmorsso.com> resolves to a deceptive website warning page from Google Safe Browsing, identifying the disputed domain name <brixmorsso.com> as unsafe and disguised phishing website.

Moreover, the likelihood that the Respondent has used or will use the disputed domain names to impersonate the Complainant and defraud the Complainant's customers suggests the Respondent is engaged or will engage in fraudulent activity.

The Respondent's significant history as a bad actor is further evidence of its bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain names. The Respondent has been named as the respondent in 67 previous UDRP proceedings. Similar to this action, in the previous proceedings, the Respondent also registered domain names that were primarily comprised of a brand owner's trademark in an attempt to trade on the brand owner's goodwill. In all but one of the previous UDRP proceedings, the Respondent was found to have registered and used the domain names in bad faith and previous panels subsequently ordered that the domain names be transferred to the complainants or cancelled.

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 names. 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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, "sso", "sfso", and "my", 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.

There is no evidence that the Respondent has used or made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or that the Respondent is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names. The disputed domain names <mybrixmorsfso.com> and <mybrixmorsso.com> have not resolved to active websites while the disputed domain name <brixmorsso.com> resolved to a website with a warning message “[t]his site has been reported as unsafe”. The Complainant has substantiated how the disputed domain name <brixmorsso.com> could be used for fraudulent purposes and this has not been rebutted by the Respondent.

Further, as regards the disputed domain name <brixmorsso.com>, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed potential phishing, 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 refers to its considerations under section 6.B. above.

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 Complainant’s mark was registered years before the registration of the disputed domain names. The disputed domain name <brixmorsso.com> resolves to a website reported as unsafe and blocked by the Internet browser’s security feature due to potential phishing as alleged and evidenced by the Complainant, which has not been rebutted by the Respondent. It is possible that the Respondent has registered this disputed domain name for the potential use to defraud Internet users. In this regard, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed as potential phishing, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

As regards the disputed domain names <mybrixmorsfso.com> and <mybrixmorsso.com>, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the alleged and un rebutted distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain names, and the failure of the Respondent to file any response, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names <mybrixmorsfso.com> and <mybrixmorsso.com> does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes 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 <brixmorsso.com>, <mybrixmorsfso.com>, and <mybrixmorsso.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Willem J. H. Leppink/

Willem J. H. Leppink

Sole Panelist

Date: June 22, 2026