

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Greenberg Traurig, LLP v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2026-2115

1. The Parties

Complainant is Greenberg Traurig, LLP, United States of America (“United States”), internally represented.

Respondent is Name Redacted. ¹

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The Disputed Domain Name <gtt-law.com> 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 15, 2026. On May 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On May 19, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on May 21, 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 26, 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”).

¹The Respondent’s name is redacted here as it appears to have engaged in identity theft by using the name and address of Complainant’s Los Angeles Office Shareholder when registering the Disputed Domain Name. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the Disputed Domain Name, which includes the name of Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case.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](#).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 28, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 17, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on June 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Richard W. Page as the sole panelist in this matter on June 26, 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 1967 in Miami, Florida, Complainant has grown to be one of the largest multi-practice law firms in the world with more than 2,200 attorneys across 40 offices in the United States, Latin America, Europe, Asia, and the Middle East. Complainant offers clients a broad range of legal services, including legal services in the fields of insurance, intellectual property, labor and employment, corporate, litigation, international trade, entertainment, real estate, energy, environmental, cybersecurity, health care, tax, public finance, and government law. Complainant both as a firm and through its individual lawyers is consistently recognized in widely distributed legal publications such as U.S. New Best Lawyers, Best Lawyers in America, Law360, The Legal 500, and Super Lawyers Magazine.

For decades, Complainant has used the trademarks GT and GREENBERG TRAUIG in connection with legal services (the "GT Mark"). Complainant owns and operates a website accessible at <gtlaw.com>. On its website, Complainant prominently uses its GT Mark to advertise and to provide information about its legal services, about the lawyers who work at the firm, and about the cities in which it has offices.

According to the web analytics website SimilarWeb.com, Complainant's website has received over eight hundred thousand visits in the last three months alone.

In addition to common law trademark rights in the GT Marks, Complainant owns multiple trademark registrations in the United States, all of which have achieved incontestable status, namely:

United States Registration No. 2,810,539 for GREENBER TRAUIG registered on February 3, 2004, in international class 42;

United States Registration No. 4,790,133 for GT registered on August 11, 2015, in international class 45; and

United States Registration No. 4,790,136 for GT GREENBER TAURIG (figurative) registered on August 11, 2025, in international class 45.

Complainant has also obtained trademark registrations for the GT Mark covering over 30 countries around the world.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on August 12, 2025, and does not resolve to any active website. The Disputed Domain Name is also enrolled in a mail exchange (MX) which allows for the sending of fraudulent emails.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the GT Mark, noting that the entirety of the GT Mark is contained in the Disputed Domain Name. Complainant further contends that the addition of an extra letter "T" and a hyphen do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Complainant further contends that the addition of the phrase "Law" only increases the likelihood of confusion based on the direct association of the phrase with Complainant's legal services and the fact that the domain name used for Complainant's website and official email addresses is <gtlaw.com>.

Complainant submits that it has never given permission to Respondent to use the GT Mark in a domain name or in any other way. Complainant further submits that Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, has not used the Disputed Domain Name in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services, and has not used the Disputed Domain Name for any legitimate non-commercial activity or fair use.

Complainant further submits that Respondent's only motive is to impersonate Complainant. Specifically, Respondent created email addresses using the Disputed Domain Name, then impersonated Complainant and sent fraudulent email messages to Complainant's clients purportedly from a lawyer of Complainant to elicit fraudulent payments and misdirect the payments to Respondent's bank account.

Complainant alleges that Respondent had actual knowledge of Complainant's rights, which is demonstrated by the use of the names of actual employees in the fraudulent email scheme.

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

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs the Panel as to the principles the Panel is to use in determining the dispute: "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules, and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable".

Even though Respondent has failed to file a Response or to contest Complainant's assertions, the Panel will review the evidence proffered by Complainant to verify that the three essential elements of the claims are met. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.3.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy directs that Complainant must prove each of the following three elements:

- i) that the Disputed Domain Name registered by Respondent is identical or confusingly similar to the GT Mark in which Complainant has rights; and,
- ii) that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name; and,
- iii) that the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1 states that registration of a trademark, here the GT Mark, prima facie satisfies the threshold requirement of Complainant having trademark rights for purposes of standing to file a UDRP case.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of the GT Mark the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

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 GT Mark and the Disputed Domain Name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The entirety of the GT Mark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the GT Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here the extra letter “t,” a hyphen, and the word “law,” 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 Name and the GT 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 Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name.

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy allows three nonexclusive methods for the Panel to conclude that Respondent has rights or a legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name:

- (i) before any notice to you [Respondent] of the dispute, your use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Disputed Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or
- (ii) you [Respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or
- (iii) you [Respondent] are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the GT Mark.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on Complainant, panels have recognized that proving that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name may result in the difficult task of “proving a negative”, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of Respondent. As such, where Complainant makes out a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to Respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name (although the burden of proof always remains on Complainant). If Respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, Complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

Panels have held that the use of the Disputed Domain Name illegitimate activity, here claimed as impersonation and a fraudulent email scheme, 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 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 the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

The Policy paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets forth four nonexclusive criteria for Complainant to show bad faith registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name:

- (i) circumstances indicating that you [Respondent] have registered or you have acquired the Disputed Domain Name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the Disputed Domain Name registration to Complainant who is the owner of the GT Mark or to a competitor of Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the Disputed Domain Name; or
- (ii) you [Respondent] have registered the Disputed Domain Names in order to prevent the owner of the GT Mark from reflecting the GT Mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) you [Respondent] have registered the Disputed Domain Names primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) by using the Disputed Domain Names, you [Respondent] 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 GT Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product on your website or location.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

As an additional element of bad faith, the Panel finds that Respondent had actual knowledge of Complainant's rights, which is demonstrated by the use of the names of actual employees in the fraudulent email scheme.

Panels have held that the use of the Disputed Domain Name for illegitimate activity, here claimed as impersonation and a fraudulent email scheme, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that 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 <gtt-law.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Richard W. Page/

Richard W. Page

Sole Panelist

Date: June 30, 2026