

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LegalZoom.com, Inc. v. Aishwar Babber
Case No. D2026-2816

1. The Parties

The Complainant is LegalZoom.com, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Zacco Sweden AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Aishwar Babber, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <legeelzoom.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 29, 2026. On June 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 6, 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 amendment to the Complaint on July 7, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 July 28, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 17, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Gonalo M. C. Da Cunha Ferreira as the sole panelist in this matter on August 25, 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 a United States technology company, founded in 2001, which provides online legal document preparation, business entity formation, attorney referral, electronic signature, virtual mail, tax, accounting, compliance and registered agent services to small businesses and consumers. The Complainant is listed on the Nasdaq Stock Market and is included in the S&P 600 index. The Complainant reported annual revenue of approximately USD 756 million and approximately 1.9 million outstanding subscription units in 2025.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous registrations for the LEGALZOOM Trade Mark in different jurisdictions around the world, including India, where the Respondent is located. These include the following:

United States Trade Mark Registration No. 2540549 for LEGALZOOM (words plus design), filed on September 29, 2000, and registered on February 19, 2002, in class 42;

United States Trade Mark Registration No. 3210728 for LEGALZOOM (word mark), filed on November 21, 2005, and registered on February 20, 2007, in class 42; and

International Trade Mark Registration No. 882524 for LEGALZOOM (word mark), registered on February 13, 2006, in class 42, designating, among other jurisdictions, the European Union.

The Complainant also owns the domain name <legalzoom.com>, which resolves to its official website. The disputed domain name was registered on February 28, 2026. At the time of filing of the Complaint the disputed domain name resolved to a website reproducing the design, layout, content and LEGALZOOM logotype of the Complainant's official website, offering business formation, estate planning and intellectual property services, and displaying the notice "© LegalZoom.com, Inc. All rights reserved." in its footer. The website contained no information about the Respondent and no disclaimer of any lack of affiliation with the Complainant.

On June 16, 2026, the Complainant's representative sent a cease and desist letter to the holder of the disputed domain name through the Registrar's abuse form, followed by a Trade Mark infringement notice submitted through the Registrar's domain holder contact form. No reply was received to either communication.

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 name. Notably, the Complainant contends that:

1. the Complainant is a United States technology company founded in 2001, listed on the Nasdaq Stock Market and included in the S&P 600 index, which has assisted in the formation of more than five million businesses, delivered more than 4.4 million estate planning solutions, has 1.9 million outstanding subscriptions and reported annual revenue of USD 756 million for 2025;

2. the Complainant has 1,200 employees worldwide and engaged approximately 700 contractors and consultants globally in 2025;

3. the Complainant is the owner of the LEGALZOOM Trade Mark, first applied for in the United States in 2000 (combined mark) and 2005 (word mark) and registered in numerous jurisdictions, including Australia, China, the European Union, Japan, Republic of Korea and the United Kingdom since 2006, and recognised in several previous decisions under the Policy;
4. the Complainant also owns many domain names incorporating its LEGALZOOM Trade Mark, such as <legalzoom.com>;
5. the disputed domain name consists of the term "legeelzoom", a deliberate misspelling of the Complainant's Trade Mark and <legalzoom.com> domain name, and is therefore confusingly similar to the Complainant's Trade Mark, the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" being irrelevant to this assessment;
6. no licence or authorisation of any kind has been given by the Complainant to the Respondent to register or use the LEGALZOOM Trade Mark, the Respondent does not trade under any name corresponding to the disputed domain name, is not an authorised representative of the Complainant and has never had a business relationship with the Complainant;
7. the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, but has intentionally chosen it on the basis of the Complainant's Trade Mark and fame to host a website designed to impersonate the Complainant and to mimic its "legalzoom.com" website, using the Complainant's logotype, design and layout without authorisation, wrongly displaying "© LegalZoom.com, Inc." in the footer, containing no genuine information about the Respondent and no disclaimer of the Respondent's lack of relationship with the Complainant;
8. the use of a domain name for illegal activity, including impersonation and passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent;
9. the Respondent's activities risk diluting and damaging the Complainant's valuable business and Trade Mark;
10. the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute a clear example of typosquatting;
11. the Complainant's Trade Mark rights predate the registration of the disputed domain name on February 28, 2026, by more than two decades and, given the confusing similarity, the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name and the widespread recognition of the LEGALZOOM Trade Mark, the Respondent was fully aware of the Complainant at the time of registration and was motivated by the Complainant's Trade Marks and domain name;
12. the Respondent's purpose is to intentionally create the false impression that the disputed domain name and the website are affiliated with or operated by the Complainant, for commercial, illicit or fraudulent purposes, which can never amount to legitimate use and is by nature in bad faith, the mere nature of the disputed domain name as a typo of a widely-known mark being itself a circumstance amounting to bad faith;
13. the Complainant sent a cease and desist letter to the Respondent via the Registrar, followed by a Trade Mark infringement notice, and received no reply to either communication, which is relevant to a finding of bad faith;
14. by registering and using the disputed domain name, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain or illicit purposes, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of that website; and

15. the registrant information disclosed by the Registrar does not correspond to the disputed domain name in any way and is most likely inaccurate, incorrect or misleading, since the address provided is incomplete and the telephone number bears the country code of Andorra, where the Respondent does not reside, and is invalid due to its length, which further indicates a lack of legitimate interest and supports a finding of bad faith.

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 Trade Mark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

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

The disputed domain name differs from the LEGALZOOM Trade Mark only in the replacement of the letter "a" by the letters "ee", so that the Trade Mark remains clearly recognisable within the disputed domain name. A domain name which consists of a common, obvious or intentional misspelling of a Trade Mark is considered confusingly similar to the relevant mark for the purposes of the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

The gTLD ".com" is a standard registration requirement and, as such, is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1. Accordingly, the Panel finds that 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 recognised 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. 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 that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has not licensed or otherwise authorised the Respondent to use the LEGALZOOM Trade Mark or to register it as a domain name. There is no evidence that the Respondent, whose name bears no resemblance to the disputed domain name, has been commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor that the Respondent holds any Trade Mark rights in the term "legeelzoom".

The record shows that the disputed domain name resolved to a website reproducing the design, layout, content and logotype of the Complainant's official website, purporting to offer the Complainant's services and displaying a footer falsely attributing the website to the Complainant, without any information about the Respondent or any disclaimer of the Respondent's lack of affiliation with the Complainant. Such use, which is designed to impersonate the Complainant and to deceive Internet users into believing that they are dealing with the Complainant, cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, including impersonation or passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1. Moreover, the composition of the disputed domain name, being a deliberate misspelling of the Complainant's Trade Mark, cannot constitute fair use.

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 name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that 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 Complainant's rights in the LEGALZOOM Trade Mark, which are registered in numerous jurisdictions including India, where the Respondent is located, predate the registration of the disputed domain name by some two decades.

The disputed domain name is a deliberate misspelling of that Trade Mark. The record shows that it resolved to a website reproducing the Complainant's own website and logotype. The Panel finds that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its Trade Mark when it registered the disputed domain name, and that it did so with the intention of targeting the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.1.4 and 3.2.1.

As to use, the disputed domain name resolved to a website impersonating the Complainant, which reproduced its branding, purported to offer its services, invited Internet users to sign in and to subscribe to a newsletter, and falsely displayed the Complainant's copyright notice. The Panel finds that, by using the disputed domain name in this manner, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Trade Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of that website, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Panels have further held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, including impersonation or passing off, is manifestly considered evidence of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

The Panel also takes into account, as corroborating circumstances, that the Respondent failed to respond to the Complainant's cease and desist letter and subsequent infringement notice, that the Respondent did not participate in this proceeding and provided no explanation for its conduct, and that the registrant contact details disclosed by the Registrar are inconsistent, combining an incomplete address in India with a telephone number bearing the country code of Andorra. The use of a privacy service and the provision of incomplete or inaccurate contact information, while not conclusive in themselves, support the inference of bad faith in the circumstances of this case. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.2.1 and 3.6.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Panel finds that the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <legeelzoom.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gonçalo M. C. Da Cunha Ferreira/

Gonçalo M. C. Da Cunha Ferreira

Sole Panelist

Date: September 8, 2026