ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Goldman Sachs & Co. LLC v. semi jeong, amory ltd,
Case No. D2026-3039

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Goldman Sachs & Co. LLC, United States of America, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is semi jeong, amory ltd, Republic of Korea.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <goldmansachsgroup.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 10, 2026. On July 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 10, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 13, 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 July 17, 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 July 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 13, 2026. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on July 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Moonchul Chang as the sole panelist in this matter on August 24, 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, a wholly-owned subsidiary of New York-headquartered the Goldman Sachs Group, Inc., is a leading global financial services firm. Founded by Marcus Goldman and Samuel Sachs in 1869, it officially assumed its present trade name in 1885.

The Complainant holds an extensive global portfolio of trademark registrations for GOLDMAN SACHS across numerous jurisdictions, including but not limited to the following:

- United States Trademark Registration (USPTO) No. 1975880, registered on May 28, 1996;

- European Union Trademark Registration (EUIPO) No. 002727865, registered on December 5, 2003; and

- Korean Trademark Registration (KIPO) No. 4100316060000, registered on June 7, 2006.

In addition, the Complainant owns and actively operates the domain name <goldmansachs.com> for its principal Internet activities.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 29, 2009, and presently resolves to a landing page displaying only a passive notice stating, "This domain is registered but may still be available." In addition, the Respondent has offered the disputed domain name for sale on the domain name aftermarket platform Sedo.com at an asking price of USD 49,000.

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.

The Complainant contends that:

(a) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the registered trademark GOLDMAN SACHS, in which the Complainant holds rights, as it incorporates the trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of the descriptive term "group."

(b) the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant has neither permitted nor authorized the Respondent to use its GOLDMAN SACHS trademark within the disputed domain name. Rather, the Respondent utilizes the disputed domain name to redirect Internet users to a page merely stating "This domain is registered but may still be available." Furthermore, the disputed domain name is offered for sale at a price substantially exceeding the out-of-pocket costs directly related to its registration, which further demonstrates the Respondent's absence of any rights or legitimate interests.

(c) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant's registration of the GOLDMAN SACHS trademark significantly predates the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name. Given the well-known nature of the mark, the Respondent was undoubtedly aware of the Complainant's rights upon registration. The disputed domain name currently resolves to an aftermarket site stating "This domain is registered, but may still be available" and is offered for sale for valuable consideration exceeding the Respondent's out-of-pocket expenses, explicitly evidencing bad faith. In addition, upon the initial filing of the Complaint, the Respondent engaged a privacy service to conceal its identity.

B. Respondent

The Respondent failed to submit any response to the Complainant's contentions. Instead, the Respondent merely emailed the Center requesting to proceed in Korean without offering any grounds for doing so, despite English being both the language of the Registration Agreement and the Complaint.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must demonstrate that the three elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied. These elements are that: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark or service mark; (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.

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 names. 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 disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark GOLDMAN SACHS in the entirety with the addition of the term "group".

The Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8. In addition, the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is disregarded under the first element test. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

Therefore, 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 the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, the overall burden of proof is on the Complainant. However, once the Complainant presents a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, the burden of production of evidence 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.

Firstly, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Although the Complainant has not given permission or authorization to the Respondent to use its GOLDMAN SACHS mark, the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name which includes the Complainant's trademark.

Secondly, the Complainant further submits that the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name has not been used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; rather, it merely redirects to a landing page advertising the disputed domain name for sale. Such use, coupled with attempts to monetize the disputed domain name through its sale, cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services and does not establish any legitimate interest under the Policy.

Thirdly, there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

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 name. 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.

Therefore, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy requires that the disputed domain name has "been registered and is being used in bad faith". Thus, for the Complainant to succeed, a UDRP panel must be satisfied that a domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith. These requirements are conjunctive; each must be proven, otherwise the Complaint fails. In addition, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

Firstly, the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's trademark GOLDMAN SACHS in its entirety, with only the addition of the term "group." In view of the Complainant's trademark being widely recognized, the Panel finds it inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration. On the contrary, the evidence demonstrates that the Respondent deliberately targeted the Complainant's mark. The Panel therefore concludes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's trademark and with the intent to exploit its commercial value, whether by selling the disputed domain name to the Complainant or to a third party for profit.

Secondly, the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to redirect users to an aftermarket platform displaying the message, "This domain is registered, but may still be available," and offering the disputed domain name for sale at a price likely exceeding the Respondent's documented out-of-pocket registration costs. Moreover, the Respondent engaged a privacy service in an attempt to obscure its identity. In light of these circumstances, the Panel concludes that such conduct constitutes bad faith use of the disputed domain name within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that 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 <goldmansachsgroup.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Moonchul Chang/
Moonchul Chang
Sole Panelist
Date: September 7, 2026