

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Invesco Ltd v. Izp, Izp
Case No. D2026-2326

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Invesco Ltd, United States of America ("US"), represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Izp, Izp, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <invesco.cfd> is registered with Dominet (HK) Limited (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 29, 2026. On May 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 1, 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 (Not Shown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 1, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on June 2, 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 the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 23, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Stefan Abel as the sole panelist in this matter on June 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

The Complainant provides financial services, in particular, investment management services. It is active in many regions of the world, in particular in North America, Europe, the Middle East, and Asia-Pacific. Accordingly, the Complainant owns, either itself or through subsidiaries, numerous international registrations of the trademark INVESCO for financial services and investment management services such as Chinese trademark no. 2018089, registered on August 14, 2004, Indian trademark no. 1237651, registered on September 17, 2003, European Union trademark no. 000030072, registered on October 14, 1999 and US trademark no. 1825441, registered on March 8, 1994.

Further, the Complainant's trademark registrations comprise a figurative element, representing a stylized mountain peak, i.e. international trademark registration no. 1101647, registered on September 2, 2011, based on European Union trademark no. 006691703, registered on February 10, 2009, designating, inter alia, China, Japan, Russia Federation, Singapore, Türkiye and Switzerland. The mountain device is displayed on the top of its website at the beginning of the navigation line under its domain name <invesco.com> as well as on the bottom-line referencing links for company information and investor relations.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 10, 2025. In October 2025 the disputed domain name resolved to a website featuring on the top of the site an exact copy of the Complainant's "mountain peak" - device above the Complainant's company name and the trademark INVESCO. It represented a login-page requiring submission of e-mail address and password to log in. It featured a registration function, too, in order to create a new account.

In March 2026, the Respondent's site was inactive ("This site can't be reached").

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

In summary, the Complainant's contentions are as follows:

Headquartered in Atlanta, the Complainant services more than 120 countries managing average assets under management of approximately USD 2.2 trillion. The Complainant employs around 7,500 professionals. As of December 31, 2025, the Complainant reported net revenues of USD 4.7 billion and has received numerous industry accolades, reflecting its excellence in investment management.

The disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark INVESCO. Additionally, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name contributes to the confusion. Prior to the Complainant's partners requesting a takedown action of the disputed domain name's website, the Respondent was using the disputed domain name to host a website featuring the Complainant's INVESCO trademark and logo in connection with a login portal.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. It is not sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The Complainant has not given the Respondent permission to use Complainant's trademarks in any manner. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name; it is not displayed in the WhoIs record. The Complainant has not licensed, authorized or permitted the Respondent to register domain names incorporating the Complainant's trademark.

The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith as the Respondent had been using the disputed domain name to host a website featuring the Complainant's INVESCO trademark and logo, along with a login portal. The Top-Level Domain ".cfd" indicates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant as it may be interpreted as a reference to a "Contract for Difference", which is a leveraged

derivative product. The Respondent had been using the disputed domain name's website to fraudulently pose as the Complainant for purposes of launching a phishing attack as it was used by the Respondent for a login portal. Apparent bad faith use does not require a positive act on the part of the Respondent – instead, passively holding a domain name can constitute a factor in finding bad faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

The Policy provides for a transfer or cancellation of the disputed domain name if the Complainant established each of the following elements set out in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy:

- (i) The Respondent's disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) The disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out certain circumstances which, in particular, but without limitation, shall be evidence of registration and use of the domain name in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name <invesco.cfd> is identical to the Complainant's trademarks.

The generic Top-Level Domain ".cfd" is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test..

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the first element of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

There is no indication that the Respondent is licensed or otherwise authorized by the Complainant to use its registered trademarks or to register the disputed domain name.

The element "invesco" of the disputed domain name does not have any apparent generic or descriptive meaning, and the term "invesco" is not used as a designation for a person or company or a company other than the Complainant or for services or products other than those provided by the Complainant.

The evidentiary burden therefore shifts to the Respondent to come forward with appropriate allegations and evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. See, e.g. *Accor v. Eren Atesmen*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-0701](#). The Respondent has failed to do so.

In addition, by having used the Complainant's "mountain peak" logo on the top of the website under the disputed domain name, it is obvious that the Respondent deliberately aims at making Internet users believe that its website is the Complainant's website. The purpose of "passing off" does not allow to assume any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the element of Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, too, for the following reasons:

The current passive holding does a priori not prevent the finding of registration and use in bad faith, according to previous UDRP panel decisions, such as *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#); *Intel Corporation v. The Pentium Group*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-0273](#).

The Complainant's trademark INVESCO is well known around the globe. It has been extensively used around the globe, including, in particular, in China where the Respondent is located, many years already before registration of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant's trademark does not have any apparent descriptive or generic meaning in English nor in the languages spoken in China, where the Respondent is located, as it is written in Latin characters. It apparently serves only to designate the Complainant's business, all the more as it is combined in the disputed domain name with the term "cfd", which may be regarded as a particular service provided by the Complainant, i.e. the management of a contract for difference, a leveraged derivative product, thus increasing the identical impression.

Moreover, the Respondent has been using a figurative element on the top of its website under the disputed domain name which was identical to the Complainant's company logo "mountain peak".

It is therefore not conceivable to the Panel that the Respondent could have registered the disputed domain name without having the Complainant and its trademarks in mind. The Respondent's intention to have the disputed domain name as a reference to the Complainant and its services is obvious to the Panel considering no rights or legitimate interests in using the disputed domain name are apparent. Noting the composition of the disputed domain name, any good faith use to which the disputed domain name may be put is implausible.

In addition, as the Respondent has used the Complainant's trademarks and the logo in conjunction with a login portal requesting Internet users to submit its email addresses and passwords and to register individual accounts, it appears that the Respondent tried to get personal or financial information from Internet users and clients of the Complainant via the disputed domain name and the website the disputed domain name resolved to. Such "passing off" behaviour and phishing scheme are, in itself, fraudulent and already sufficient demonstration of bad faith registration and use under the Policy. See *Accor v. SANGHO HEO / Contact Privacy Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2014-1471](#); *Twitter, Inc. v. Whois Agent, Whois Privacy Protection Service, Inc. / Domain Support*, WIPO Case No. [D2015-1488](#).

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraph 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <inveso.cfd> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Stefan Abel/

Stefan Abel

Sole Panelist

Date: July 9, 2026