

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Pearl Cohen LLP v. mon nehh, BiG
Case No. D2026-3640

1. The Parties

Complainant is Pearl Cohen LLP, United States of America ("United States"), internally represented.

Respondent is mon nehh, BiG, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <pearlscohen.com> (the "Domain Name") is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 13, 2026. On August 14, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On August 17, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Privacy service provided by WITHHELD FOR PRIVACY LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on August 21, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on August 25, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 28, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 17, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on September 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Kimberley Chen Nobles as the sole panelist in this matter on September 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

Complainant is a global law firm which has been providing legal services under the Pearl Cohen name for over 25 years. With more than 200 lawyers and 350 professionals globally, Complainant maintains six offices in Israel, the United Kingdom and the United States. Complainant owns United States registered trademark number 5,867,206 for the PEARL COHEN word mark, registered on September 24, 2019. Complainant also owns the domain name <pearlcohen.com>, registered on May 8, 2013, which it operates as its business website.

The Domain Name was registered on July 25, 2026, resolved to a webpage associated with the Registrar, stating, “pearlscohen.com has been recently registered with namecheap.com” and includes generic advertising information for the Registrar. However, it was configured to set up email communications capability, which was used to send fraudulent emails to Complainant’s client in which Respondent impersonated Complainant’s employees using emails with the Domain Name extension “@pearlscohen.com”, in an attempt to divert client payments to Respondent.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name.

Notably, Complainant contends that (i) the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant’s trademark; (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

In particular, Complainant contends that it has trademark registrations and rights for PEARL COHEN and that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name <pearlscohen.com>, which is a typosquatted variant where the letter “s” is added between “pearl” and “cohen” of Complainant’s mark.

Complainant notes that it has not authorized Respondent to register or use a domain name which includes Complainant’s trademark, and that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the registration and use of the Domain Name. Rather, Complainant contends that Respondent has acted in bad faith in acquiring and setting up the Domain Name, when Respondent clearly knew of Complainant’s rights. Specifically, Complainant argues that Respondent used the Domain Name to set up email services to send fraudulent emails to Complainant’s clients in which Respondent impersonated Complainant’s employees through the use of emails with the Domain Name extension “@pearlscohen.com”, in an attempt to divert client payments to Respondent.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant’s contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, to succeed Complainant must satisfy the Panel that:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights;
- (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Section 4.3 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”) states that failure to respond to complainant’s contentions would not by itself mean that the complainant is deemed to have prevailed; a respondent’s default is not necessarily an admission that the complainant’s claims are true.

Thus, although in this case Respondent has failed to respond to the Complaint, the burden remains with Complainant to establish the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy by a preponderance of the evidence.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Complainant has provided evidence of its rights in the PEARL COHEN trademark, as noted above, through its trademark registrations. Complainant has therefore proven that it has the requisite rights in the PEARL COHEN trademarks for the purposes of the Policy.

With Complainant’s rights in the PEARL COHEN trademark established, the remaining question under the first element of the Policy is whether the Domain Name, typically disregarding the Top-Level Domain (“TLD”) in which it was registered (in this case, “.com”), is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant’s trademark. See, e.g., *B & H Foto & Electronics Corp. v. Domains by Proxy, Inc. / Joseph Gross*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-0842](#).

Here, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant’s PEARL COHEN trademark. The PEARL COHEN trademark is recognizable in the Domain Name.

The addition of the letter “s” between “pearl” and “cohen”, in the Domain Name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the PEARL COHEN trademark. See section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

Thus, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied the first element of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, a complainant must make a prima facie showing that a respondent possesses no rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. See, e.g., *Malayan Banking Berhad v. Beauty, Success & Truth International*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-1393](#). Once a complainant makes such a prima facie showing, the burden of production shifts to the respondent, though the burden of proof always remains on the complainant. If the respondent fails to come forward with relevant evidence showing rights or legitimate interests, the complainant will have sustained its burden under the second element of the UDRP. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1

From the record in this case, it is evident that Respondent was, and is, aware of Complainant and its PEARL COHEN trademark and does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Complainant has confirmed that Respondent is not authorized to use the PEARL COHEN trademark or to seek registration of any domain name incorporating this trademark. Respondent is also not known to be associated with the PEARL COHEN trademark and there is no evidence showing that Respondent has been commonly known by the Domain Name.

In addition, Respondent has not used the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Rather, the record shows that the Domain Name was used to send fraudulent emails to Complainant’s client, in which Respondent impersonated Complainant’s

employees through the use of email addresses with the Domain Name extension “@pearlscohen.com”, in an attempt to divert client payments to Respondent.

UDRP panels have consistently held that use of a domain name for illegal activity — such as email phishing, impersonation, or passing off — can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Accordingly, Complainant has provided evidence supporting its prima facie showing that Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Respondent has failed to produce countervailing evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Thus, the Panel concludes that Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name and Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel finds that Respondent’s actions indicate that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances indicating bad faith registration and use on the part of a respondent, namely:

“(i) circumstances indicating that you have registered or you have acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of your documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) you have registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that you have engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) you have registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product or service on your website or location.”

The Panel finds that Complainant has provided evidence to show that registration of the PEARL COHEN trademark predates the registration of the Domain Name. The Panel finds that Complainant is also well established and well-known under the PEARL COHEN trademark. Therefore, and also noting the use analysis below, Respondent was likely aware of the PEARL COHEN trademark when it registered the Domain Name.

The Panel therefore finds that Respondent’s awareness of Complainant’s trademark rights at the time of registration suggests bad faith. See *Red Bull GmbH v. Credit du Léman SA, Jean-Denis Deletraz*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-2209](#); *Nintendo of America Inc v. Marco Beijen, Beijen Consulting, Pokemon Fan Clubs Org., and Pokemon Fans Unite*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-1070](#); and *BellSouth Intellectual Property Corporation v. Serena, Axel*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0007](#).

As noted above, the record shows that Respondent had used the Domain Name to engage in illegal activity, namely, sending fraudulent emails to Complainant’s client in which Respondent impersonated Complainant’s employees in an attempt to solicit client payments. The emails, sent from email addresses created with the Domain Name extension “@pearlscohen.com”, sought to engage Complainant’s client, with the intent of rerouting the client’s payment to Respondent’s account. One of Respondent’s emails included Respondent’s

bank name, address and account details, which further caused confusion to recipients, further indicative of Respondent's intent to deceive Internet users and commit fraud.

UDRP panels have consistently held that a respondent's use of a domain name to trade off goodwill in a complainant's well-known trademark and impersonate the complainant for fraudulent purposes, as here, constitutes bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Moreover, such use of the Domain Name may potentially result in tarnishing Complainant's reputation and goodwill.

Finally, the Panel also notes the failure of Respondent to submit a Response, and Respondent's use of a privacy service to mask its identity. The Panel thus considers such factors further support Respondent's registration and use of the Domain Name in bad faith. In the present circumstances, considering the reputation of the PEARL COHEN trademark, the composition of the Domain Name, and the fraudulent use of the Domain Name, the Panel finds that Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

Therefore, the Panel finds that Complainant succeeds under the third element of paragraph 4(a) 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 Domain Name <pearlscohen.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Kimberley Chen Nobles/

Kimberley Chen Nobles

Sole Panelist

Date: October 5, 2026