WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

**ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER**

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Principal Financial Services, Inc. v. Macharl Graham, Simon Jones
Case No. D2026-2427

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Principal Financial Services, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Neal & McDevitt, United States.

The Respondents are Macharl Graham, United Kingdom; Simon Jones, Seychelles and United Kingdom.[1]

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <am-principal.com>, <com-au-am.com>, <com-home-eu.com>, <principalam-portal.com>, and <principalcp.com> are registered with Nicenic International Group Co., Limited; the disputed domain name <cp-principal.com> is registered with Key-Systems GmbH; the disputed domain name <principalam-client.com> is registered with Unstoppable Domains Inc. (collectively the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 4, 2026 as regards the disputed domain names <principalam-portal.com>, <principalam-client.com>, <am-principal.com>, <com-au-am.com>, and <com-home-eu.com>. On June 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 4, 2026, and June 5, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Unstoppable Privacy Service LLC and REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 8, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names 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 June 16, 2026, in which the Complainant requested addition of the two domain names <principalcp.com> and <cp-principal.com> into the proceeding.

[1] The Panel notes that the Respondent simon jones used country codes “SC” and “GB” in registering different disputed domain names. However, the email address used by the Respondent is the same.

On June 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the additional disputed domain names. On June 17, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondents are listed as the registrants and providing the contact details.

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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 22, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on August 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Pablo A. Palazzi as the sole panelist in this matter on August 13, 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 is Principal Financial Services, Inc., a publicly traded multinational financial services corporation headquartered in Des Moines, Iowa, United States. Through its licensees, affiliates, and member companies, the Complainant offers a broad range of services in the financial, insurance, investment, banking, retirement, global asset management, real estate, and healthcare sectors.

The Complainant has used the PRINCIPAL mark in connection with financial services since at least as early as 1960 (via a predecessor-in-interest), and has used its broader family of PRINCIPAL marks in connection with financial, insurance, investment, banking, asset management, retirement, real estate, and healthcare services since at least as early as 1985.

The Complainant operates a global website for its affiliate's Principal Asset Management operations at "www.principalam.com", which serves multiple countries or regions including the United States, Australia, Europe, Asia, Canada, Japan, Latin America, and the Middle East.

The Complainant owns the following trademark registrations, among others, on which the Complaint is based:

(i) PRINCIPAL, United States, Registration No. 1,562,541, registered October 24, 1989;

(ii) PRINCIPAL, United States, Registration No. 3,324,583, registered October 30, 2007;

(iii) PRINCIPAL ASSET MANAGEMENT, United States, Registration No. 7,245,987, registered December 19, 2023;

(iv) PRINCIPAL FINANCIAL GROUP (Stylized), Australia, Registration No. 1,220,192, registered March 10, 2009; and

(v) PRINCIPAL (and Design), European Union, Registration No. 000094318, registered July 10, 1998.

The disputed domain names, together with their registration dates are as follows: <principalam-portal.com>, registered May 23, 2026; <principalam-client.com>, registered May 14, 2026; <am-principal.com>, registered May 4, 2026; <com-au-am.com>, registered May 10, 2026; <com-home-eu.com>, registered May 4, 2026; <principalcp.com>, registered June 2, 2026; and <cp-principal.com>, registered June 11, 2026.

As of the date of this Decision, none of the seven disputed domain names are active. The Complaint indicates that the disputed domain names <principalam-portal.com>, <principalam-client.com>, <com-au-am.com>, <com-home-eu.com>, <cp-principal.com>, and <principalcp.com> were previously employed to operate fraudulent financial portals—designed to harvest user credentials through deceptive login and registration pages, and the disputed domain name <am-principal.com> was used to dispatch phishing emails impersonating an employee of the Complainant.

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.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes the following:

(i) Shared name server infrastructure: all seven disputed domain names use the identical Cloudflare name servers across all registrars involved.

(ii) Registration timing: all seven disputed domain names were registered within a narrow window of approximately five weeks in May and early June 2026; specifically, <com-home-eu.com> and <am-principal.com> were both registered on May 4, 2026; <com-au-am.com> on May 10, 2026; <principalam-client.com> on May 14, 2026; <principalam-portal.com> on May 23, 2026; <principalcp.com> on June 2, 2026; and <cp-principal.com> on June 11, 2026.

(iii) Common registrar for five of the seven domain names: five of the seven disputed domain names — <principalam-portal.com>, <am-principal.com>, <com-au-am.com>, <com-home-eu.com>, and <principalcp.com> — are registered with the same registrar, Nicenic International Group Co., Ltd. ("Nicenic domains").

(iv) Consistent identity concealment: all seven disputed domain names employ identity concealment through privacy services or redaction, using three distinct concealment mechanisms: redaction for privacy (Nicenic domains), the Unstoppable Privacy Service LLC (<principalam-client.com>), and the whoisproxy.com privacy service (<cp-principal.com>).

(v) Common naming conventions: the disputed domain names reflect deliberate and related naming patterns targeting the Complainant's marks and its legitimate domain names at <principalam.com>: <principalam-portal.com> and <principalam-client.com> share the identical "principalam" prefix combined with an additional term; <am-principal.com> and <com-au-am.com> both incorporate "am" as an abbreviation for "asset management"; <principalcp.com> and <cp-principal.com> employ the identical elements — "cp" (abbreviation for "client portal") and the PRINCIPAL mark — in reversed order, a mirror-image naming pattern; and six out of seven disputed domain names are connected to the "principalam" formative either directly in the domain name, through subdomains incorporating "principalam", or through technical integration with the "principalam" phishing infrastructure.

(vi) Identical website architecture: the fraudulent login pages hosted at <principalcp.com> and <cp-principal.com> both employ an identical "/users/" URL path structure, matching the architecture of the fraudulent portals at <principalam-portal.com> and <principalam-client.com>, confirming that all disputed domain names are operated as part of a single integrated scheme.

(vii) Unified pattern of fraudulent conduct targeting the same mark: all the disputed domain names are used in furtherance of a single coordinated fraudulent scheme targeting the Complainant's PRINCIPAL and PRINCIPAL ASSET MANAGEMENT mark within the financial services sector, through a consistent methodology of phishing, employee impersonation, credential harvesting, and fraudulent website impersonation.

(viii) Common underlying registrant identity: following registrar verification, six of the seven disputed domain names were disclosed as registered by the same underlying registrant, simon jones ([…]@gmail.com), across two different registrars (Nicenic, and Key-Systems), with the seventh (<principalam-client.com>) registered by Macharl Graham ([…]@gmail.com) — both providing London, United Kingdom addresses.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

6.2. Substantive issues

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 Panel finds the mark PRINCIPAL is recognizable within the disputed domain names <am-principal.com>, <principalam-portal.com>, <principalcp.com>, <cp-principal.com>, and <principalam-client.com>. Accordingly, these 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 “am” (abbreviation for “asset management”), “portal”, “client”, and “cp” (abbreviation for “client portal”) 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 mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8.

The Panel also notes that there are two disputed domain names that have been used with the sub-domain names <principalam.com-au-am.com> and <principalam.com-home-eu.com> in order to create a misleading impression of association with the Complainant. Specifically, the disputed domain names <com-au-am.com> and <com-home-eu.com> do not contain the PRINCIPAL mark within the second-level domain itself.

The Policy applies to a domain name registered with a Registrar but it does not extend independently to sub-domain names created beneath that registered domain name. Accordingly, for purposes of the first element of the Policy, the relevant comparison is between the Complainant’s trademark and the disputed domain name itself, ordinarily disregarding the applicable Top-Level Domain.

As reflected in section 1.7 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, the test is essentially a standing requirement and requires the Complainant’s mark to be recognizable within the disputed domain name. A trademark appearing only in a third-level sub-domain cannot ordinarily supply the confusing similarity where the mark is not recognizable in the registered second-level domain.

In view of the Panel, this follows from the structure of the DNS and the scope of the Policy: the registrant controls and may create numerous sub-domains under a registered domain name, but those sub-domains are not themselves the domain names registered with the Registrar or the domain names that may be transferred or cancelled under the Policy. Thus, although in this case the Respondent’s use of <principalam.com-au-am.com> and <principalam.com-home-eu.com> may constitute compelling evidence that the Respondent was targeting the Complainant and may therefore be relevant to the assessment of rights or legitimate interests and bad faith, it cannot substitute for the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy that the disputed domain names themselves be identical or confusingly similar to a mark in which the Complainant has rights.

Since the PRINCIPAL mark is not recognizable in either <com-au-am.com> or <com-home-eu.com>, the Panel finds that the Complainant has not established the first element of the Policy with respect to these two disputed domain names.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established with respect to the disputed domain names <am-principal.com>, <principalam-portal.com>, <principalcp.com> , <cp-principal.com>, and <principalam-client.com>. These domain names are hereinafter referred to as the “disputed domain names”.

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.

In the present case the Panel notes that the disputed domain names were registered to operate fraudulent websites impersonating the Complainant's regional operations.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here claimed phishing/identity theft, unauthorized account access/hacking, passing off, or other types of fraud 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 a domain name in bad faith.

The evidence shows that the disputed domain names form part of a coordinated fraudulent scheme targeting the Complainant and its PRINCIPAL and PRINCIPAL ASSET MANAGEMENT marks.

Four of the disputed domain names have been used to operate fraudulent websites impersonating the Complainant, including fake login and registration portals designed to collect users' personal, financial, and banking information. One disputed domain name has also been used for phishing emails impersonating an actual employee of the Complainant.

Such conduct demonstrates that the Respondent was clearly aware of the Complainant and deliberately registered and used the disputed domain names to impersonate the Complainant, deceive Internet users, and facilitate phishing and other fraudulent activities.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

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 <am-principal.com>, <cp-principal.com>, <principalam-client.com>, <principalam-portal.com>, and <principalcp.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

The Complaint is denied with respect to the domain names <com-au-am.com> and <com-home-eu.com>.

/Pablo A. Palazzi/
Pablo A. Palazzi
Sole Panelist
Date: September 4, 2026