

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Lima One Capital v. taewoo choi  
Case No. D2026-1970

### **1. The Parties**

Complainant is Lima One Capital, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Soteria LLC, United States.

Respondent is taewoo choi, United States.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <liamonecapital.com> (the “Domain Name”) is 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 6, 2026. On May 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On May 7, 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 (Registration Private) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on May 14, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on May 14, 2026.

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 8, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on June 13, 2026.

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

Founded in 2011, Complainant specializes in private real estate investment lending, offering underwriting, construction management and services that offer investment loans with flexible financing options. Complainant owns United States registered trademark number 4,978,940 for the LIMA ONE word mark, registered on June 14, 2016, with a first use date of August 20, 2012. Complainant also owns and operates its official website at the domain name <limaone.com>.

The Domain Name was registered on April 27, 2026. At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name was redirected to a website purportedly providing credit or financial services.

#### **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 LIMA ONE and that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name, which is a typosquatted variant where a letter "a" from LIMA ONE is transposed/reversed with the letter "m", with the intention to confuse Internet users looking for bona fide and well-known LIMA ONE 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 a variant of Complainant's trademark (reversal of the third and fourth letters of Complainant's trademark) in registering the Domain Name in furtherance of an illegal scheme to impersonate Complainant.

##### **B. Respondent**

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

#### **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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[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 LIMA ONE trademark, as noted above. The Domain Name was registered after registration of Complainant’s United States federally registered LIMA ONE trademark, and the trademark has been in use since as early as 2012. Complainant has therefore proven that it has the requisite rights in the LIMA ONE trademark.

With Complainant’s rights in the LIMA ONE trademark established, the remaining question under the first element of the Policy is whether the Domain Name, typically disregarding the Top-Level Domain (“TLD”) in which it was registered (in this case, “.com”), is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant’s trademark. See, e.g., *B & H Foto & Electronics Corp. v. Domains by Proxy, Inc. / Joseph Gross*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-0842](#).

Here, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant’s LIMA ONE trademark. The LIMA ONE trademark is recognizable in the Domain Name.

The absence of a space between “LIMA” and “ONE”, the reversal of the letter “a” with the letter “m” in LIMA ONE, which is essentially a transposition of the letters, and the addition of the descriptive term “capital” in the Domain Name, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the LIMA ONE trademark. 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 LIMA ONE 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 LIMA ONE trademarks or to seek registration of any domain name incorporating these trademarks. Respondent is also not known to be associated with the LIMA ONE trademarks and there is no evidence showing that Respondent has been commonly known by the Domain Name.

The registration of the Domain Name is an attempt in typosquatting, whereby the Domain Name is intended to confuse Internet users into believing the Domain Name belongs to Complainant. See e.g., *Debevoise & Plimpton LLP v. Keyword Marketing, Inc. / Web Advertising, Corp.*, WIPO Case No. [D2007-1679](#) (explaining “typosquatting” is “a form of cybersquatting in which a respondent registers and uses a domain name in order to take advantage of typographical errors made by Internet users seeking the complainant’s commercial website”).

Here, the Domain Name not only is an attempt in typosquatting, it also includes the term “capital” which is part of Complainant’s business name “Lima One Capital”. In addition, Complainant owns and operates its business website at the domain name <limaone.com>.

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. The Panel notes, in accordance with section 4.8 of [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), that the Domain Name redirects to a website which purportedly offers credit or financial services, which is in the same or related industry as Complainant.

In the absence of contrary evidence, the Panel finds that Respondent knew of or should have known of Complainant’s trademarks and services at the time Respondent registered the Domain Name.

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 LIMA ONE trademark long predate the registration of the Domain Name. Complainant is also well established and known; indeed, the record shows that Complainant’s LIMA ONE trademark and related services are widely known and recognized for purposes of the Policy. Therefore, and also noting the use analysis below, Respondent was clearly aware of the LIMA ONE 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. 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 Name's inclusion of Complainant's trademark in its entirety, with the transposition of the letters as discussed above, is clearly an attempt in typosquatting, whereby the Domain Name is intended to confuse Internet users into believing the Domain Name belongs to Complainant. Such adoption of Complainant's trademark at the time of registration of the Domain Name is a common tactic for potential phishing schemes, where individuals seek to pass themselves off as companies or entities in the hopes of seeking an advantage, from current or potential clients of those companies or entities. 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](#); and *Ropes & Gray LLP v. matthew rolland, ropes gray*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-0288](#).

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. The Panel notes that the Domain Name currently redirects to a website located which purportedly offers credit or financial services, which is in the same or related industry as 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, as here, constitutes bad faith. See *Philip Morris Products S.A. v. homn mohmoodi*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-4158](#). 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. The Panel thus considers such factor further supports Respondent's registration and use constitutes bad faith.

In the present circumstances, considering the reputation of the LIMA ONE trademark, and the redirection 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 <liamonecapital.com> be transferred to Complainant.

*/Kimberley Chen Nobles/*

**Kimberley Chen Nobles**

Sole Panelist

Date: July 2, 2026