

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Rothschild & Co Continuation Holdings A.G. v. Privacy Department,
IceNetworks Ltd.

Case No. D2026-3496

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Rothschild & Co Continuation Holdings A.G., Switzerland, represented by Freshfields LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Privacy Department, IceNetworks Ltd., Iceland.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <rothschildglobalmarkets.com> is registered with Internet Domain Service BS Corp (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on August 6, 2026. On August 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 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 (Domain Admin, Whois Privacy Corp.) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 11, 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 August 11, 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 August 13, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 2, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on September 10, 2026.

The Center appointed María Alejandra López García 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 Complainant is part of the Rothschild & Co group, an established, independent financial services provider operating worldwide, and it has been active for over two centuries. The Rothschild & Co group provides mergers and acquisitions strategy and financing advice, as well as investment and wealth management solutions, to large institutions, families, individuals and governments.

ROTHSCHILD owes its name to a family that originated in Frankfurt in the 15th century. Mayer Amschel Rothschild created the family's first partnership agreement in 1810.

The Complainant and affiliated entities are the registered owners of, or otherwise have rights in, several registrations for the trademarks ROTHSCCHILD & CO and ROTHSCCHILD, as follows:

- European Union trade mark for the term ROTHSCCHILD (word mark), Registration number 000206458, registered on October 8, 1998, in force until April 1, 2036, covering goods in International Class ("IC") 14; and
- United Kingdom trade mark for the term ROTHSCCHILD (word mark), Registration number UK00001285831, filed on October 1, 1986, registered on October 5, 1990, in force until October 1, 2027, covering services in IC 35; and
- United Kingdom trade mark for the term ROTHSCCHILD (word mark), Registration number UK00001285832, filed on October 1, 1986, registered on October 12, 1990, in force until October 1, 2027, covering services in IC 36.

The Respondent is Privacy Department, IceNetworks Ltd., from Iceland.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on May 21, 2026, and it currently resolves to an inactive website. The Complainant provided evidence showing that the disputed domain name was used in connection with fraudulent emails impersonating the Complainant. Additionally, the evidence shows that, as at June 1, 2026, the disputed domain name resolved to an active website operating as a fraudulent credential-harvesting portal.

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 is confusingly similar to its well-known trademark ROTHSCCHILD, and that the addition of the terms “global” and “markets” does not distinguish the disputed domain name from the Complainant’s trademarks. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent deliberately selected the Complainant’s well-known trademark ROTHSCCHILD, combined it with terms associated with the Complainant’s financial services, and targeted Internet users seeking the Complainant’s distinguished financial services. The disputed domain name is being used in connection with fraudulent emails impersonating the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (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.

In accordance with paragraph 5(f) of the Rules, in the absence of a Response, the Panel shall decide the dispute based upon the Complaint. The complainant bears the burden of proof; a respondent’s default does not, by itself, mean that the complainant is deemed to have prevailed. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”), section 4.3. Therefore, the Panel will decide this case based on the “balance of probabilities” or “preponderance of the evidence” standard. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.2.

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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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, “global” and “markets” 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 use of the disputed domain name has been illegitimate in its entirety. The Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services, nor for any legitimate noncommercial purpose. Instead, the unrebutted evidence shows that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to deceive and to abuse Internet users by sending fraudulent emails impersonating the Complainant and engaging in phishing activities, which is the opposite of a bona fide or legitimate use.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed as phishing, impersonation, 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.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that by the time the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, the Complainant’s trademark ROTHCHILD was well-known and recognized at a worldwide level; furthermore, the fraudulent use given to it confirms the Respondent’s knowledge of the Complainant’s financial services and of the value of the trademark ROTHCHILD. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2.

The Panel also notes that the named Respondent is “Privacy Department, IceNetworks Ltd.” While privacy registrations are generally permissible, the Panel is of the view that privacy services cannot be deployed to conduct or insulate abusive domain name use under the Policy. , [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.6.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed as phishing, impersonation, or other types of fraud, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <rothschildglobalmarkets.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/María Alejandra López García/

María Alejandra López García

Sole Panelist

Date: September 28, 2026