ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LF, LLC v. Jahir Khan
Case No. D2026-3485

1. The Parties

The Complainant is LF, LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Markmonitor Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Jahir Khan, India.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <wwwlowescomsurvey.com> is registered with Eranet International Limited (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 6, 2026. On August 6, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 12, 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 the Complainant on August 12, 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 August 14, 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 August 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 7, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Jeremy Speres as the sole panelist in this matter on September 16, 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 uncontested facts are as follows. The Complainant is a wholly owned subsidiary of United States corporation Lowe's Companies, Inc. ("Lowe's"), on whose behalf it owns and manages intellectual property. Lowe's, together with its subsidiaries, is a Fortune 100 home improvement company, employing approximately 300,000 associates and operating over 1,750 home improvement stores. In the fiscal year 2025, Lowe's achieved USD 86.3 billion in sales.

Lowe's operates its main retail website from the URL "www.lowes.com", the domain name for which was registered in 1995.

The Complainant owns the following trademark registrations, amongst others:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 1168799 LOWE'S in class 42, having a registration date of September 8, 1981.

- Indian Trademark Registration No. 2696961 LOWE'S in classes 35 and 42, having a registration date of March 11, 2014.[1]

The disputed domain name was registered on January 2, 2026, and at the time the Complaint was filed and presently resolves to a website entitled "Lowes.com/survey", "Lowes.com/Survey: Key Requirements and Helpful Tips", displaying the Complainant's logo as its favicon and imagery of the outside of one of the Complainant's stores. The website states: "Let us first give you an understanding of their products and services. You must know that before you get into the survey thing.", "In order to make lowe's retail stores serve you best and become the best of their kind, you can opt for the survey. Give your feedback and in return win the gift cards worth $500." In one of the tabs located at the bottom of the webpage, there is a disclaimer stating: "The information provided on this website is for education purposes only. The website or any of the authors does not hold any responsibility for the suitability, accuracy, authenticity, or completeness of the information within. We are not associated with Lowes Survey. This is third-party website."

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 the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith in order to impersonate the Complainant and its customer survey for the Respondent's commercial gain.

B. Respondent

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

---

[1] In accordance with its powers articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, the Panel is entitled to conduct limited independent research into matters of public record. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.8.

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 trademark and the disputed domain name. 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 entirety of the mark excluding the apostrophe (which cannot be reproduced within domain names) is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here "www", "com", and "survey", 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 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.

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 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.

The Panel notes that the website associated with the disputed domain name at first glance could be considered to be an informational website on the Complainant's survey program. The question for the Panel is therefore whether such use may be considered to be fair within the framework of the Policy. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.7. Here, the Panel notes the high proximity between the composition of the disputed domain name <wwwlowescomsurvey.com> and the Complainant's own URL "www.lowes.com/survey" for its official survey, the use of the Complainant's logo as a favicon, and the footer-only disclaimer which does not cure the misleading nature of the disputed domain name and the favicon.

The Panel also notes the presence of a large "Get Started" button displayed prominently on the disputed domain name's website, which, when clicked, presently does not lead to anything. Viewed in the context of the other similarities identified above, the "Get Started" button conveys the impression that users may proceed to take the survey through the website. This goes beyond a purely informational purpose. In particular, if the website were intended merely to provide information about the Lowe's survey, there would be no apparent reason for such a prominent invitation to "Get Started". The circumstances therefore support an inference that the website was intended to attract users who might believe that they were accessing the official Lowe's survey, rather than merely obtaining information about it.

The website's own "Terms & Conditions" page provides further evidence that the website was not intended as a purely non-commercial informational resource. Those terms identify the purported operator as "Tv Activate Code (TAC)" and expressly contemplate that users may make purchases through the "Service", referring to amounts "actually paid" through the Service and to goods or services available through third-party websites. Additionally, the same purported operator, address, and substantially identical Terms & Conditions appear on a website concerning the California Lottery, namely "www.californiallottery.com/terms-conditions". This conflicts with any suggestion that the website constitutes a genuine Lowe's-related informational undertaking and supports an inference that commercial use of the website was contemplated.

In the circumstances, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was likely selected for its close resemblance with the Complainant's domain name to attract Internet users to the Respondent's website, taking an unfair advantage of the discussed similarities, rather than legitimately holding an informational website. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here likely impersonation (as addressed in relation to bad faith below), 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.

For the following reasons, the Panel finds that it is more likely than not that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name to take advantage of the likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark for the Respondent's likely advantage, which the Panel considers amounts to bad faith under the Policy. In light of the findings raised under the second element above concerning contemplated commercial use of the Respondent's website, the Panel considers that paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy may well be applicable.

Lowe's invites its customers to provide feedback via a URL printed on their receipts, "www.lowes.com/survey", which redirects them to the official survey partner. In exchange for providing feedback, Lowe's customers are offered a chance to enter a monthly draw to win USD 500. The Respondent appears to refer to its website as "Lowes.com/survey", which is the Complainant's official URL for its customer satisfaction survey. Furthermore, the Respondent's website includes Lowe's logo as its favicon and imagery of one of Lowe's stores. This points directly to some sort of impersonation of the Complainant or at least using certain similarities to attract Internet users.

The composition of the disputed domain name also points to targeting. Panels have long held that including the "www" subdomain within the composition of a disputed domain name itself, i.e., without the intervening dot, is an indicator of typosquatting intent. See *Pfizer, Inc. v. Seocho and Vladimir Snezko*, WIPO Case No. D2001-1199. That is especially the case here, where the disputed domain name consists entirely of the components of the Complainant's own survey URL, "www.lowes.com/survey".

The Panel finds that the 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 <wwwlowescomsurvey.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jeremy Speres/
Jeremy Speres
Sole Panelist
Date: September 23, 2026