ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
LCP Belgium NV v. Sinzu Money, hagsggs
Case No. D2026-3987

1. The Parties

The Complainant is LCP Belgium NV, Belgium, internally represented.

The Respondent is Sinzu Money, hagsggs, Andorra.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <logisticscaptialpartners.com> (the "Disputed 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 September 8, 2026. On September 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On September 8, 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 (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 9, 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 September 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 September 17, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 7, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Mariia Koval as the sole panelist in this matter on October 15, 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, founded in 2018, operates in the real estate sector, with a particular focus on the development and management of logistics and warehousing properties. Its activities include the development of logistics facilities and the provision of real estate solutions, including leasing and build-to-suit developments.

The Complainant is the owner of the following LOGISTICS CAPITAL PARTNERS trademark registrations (the "LOGISTICS CAPITAL PARTNERS Trademark"):

- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 018465157, registered on November 18, 2021, in classes 36, 37 and 39;

- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00003663904, registered on November 26, 2021, in classes 36, 37 and 39;

- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00003673794, registered on November 26, 2021, in classes 36, 37 and 39.

The Complainant has also an Internet presence for its LOGISTICS CAPITAL PARTNERS Trademark. The Complainant operates the domain name <logisticscapitalpartners.com> from 2014, which is used to advertise and provide information regarding its services under the LOGISTICS CAPITAL PARTNERS Trademark.

The registration date of the Disputed Domain Name is June 30, 2026. As at the date of this Decision and when the Complaint was filed, the Disputed Domain Name resolves to an inactive website. Moreover, according to the evidence presented by the Complainant (Annex 8 to the Complaint) two active mail exchange ("MX") records are set up.

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 the Complainant's LOGISTICS CAPITAL PARTNERS Trademark since the Disputed Domain Name reproduces the textual component of the Complainant's LOGISTICS CAPITAL PARTNERS Trademark in its entirety, with a single alteration: the letters "it" in "capital" are transposed to "ti", producing "captial". The LOGISTICS CAPITAL PARTNERS Trademark remains plainly recognisable within the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainant further claims that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name in view of the following:

- the Respondent is not, and has never been, licensed, authorised or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to use its LOGISTICS CAPITAL PARTNERS Trademark or to register any domain name incorporating it. There is no relationship of any kind between the Parties;

- there is no evidence of any use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Disputed Domain Name or a corresponding name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Disputed Domain Name serves no substantive content;
- the Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name or by any corresponding name;
- there is no legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name. The only functional infrastructure the Respondent has established is the capability to send and receive electronic mail from addresses confusingly similar to the Complainant's own.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith based on the following. The Disputed Domain Name constitutes an obvious typographical variation of the Complainant's LOGISTICS CAPITAL PARTNERS Trademark and domain name, differing only by the transposition of two letters, and was registered long after the Complainant had established its Trademark rights and online presence.

The Complainant further submits that, although the Disputed Domain Name does not resolve to an active website, the Respondent deliberately configured it for email services through Proton Mail, as evidenced by its MX records and domain verification record (Annex 8 to the Complaint). The Complainant argues that such configuration creates a risk of impersonation and interception of business correspondence, particularly given the nature of its business and its dealings with institutional counterparties. However, the Complainant does not allege that any fraudulent emails have actually been sent.

The Complainant also points to the Respondent's provision of allegedly fabricated registration details, use of a privacy protection service, and continued technical maintenance of the Disputed Domain Name as further indications of bad faith. In addition, the Complainant argues that the absence of an active website does not preclude a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding, particularly considering the distinctive nature of its LOGISTICS CAPITAL PARTNERS Trademark, the composition of the Disputed Domain Name, and the absence of any apparent legitimate purpose for its registration.

Finally, the Complainant notes that the Disputed Domain Name was registered on June 30, 2026, shortly after the public announcement of a major logistics development involving the Complainant's group, which, in its view, further supports the inference that the Respondent was aware of and deliberately targeted the Complainant and its trademark.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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

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

(ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name was 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 name. 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 comprises an obvious misspelling of the Complainant's LOGISTICS CAPITAL PARTNERS Trademark with the exception of the transposition of the letters "it" in the word "capital" to "ti", resulting in the misspelling "captial", followed by the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com". The Disputed Domain Name appears to be a typical example of typosquatting, i.e., an intentional misspelling of the Complainant's LOGISTICS CAPITAL PARTNERS Trademark. According to section 1.9 of the WIPO Overview 3.1, a domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. The Panel finds that the transposition of the letters "it" to "ti" in the Disputed Domain Name does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity with the Complainant's LOGISTICS CAPITAL PARTNERS Trademark.

According to the WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11, the applicable gTLD in a domain name (e.g., ".com", ".club", ".nyc") is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's LOGISTICS CAPITAL PARTNERS Trademark pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

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 concludes that there is no relation, disclosed to the Panel or otherwise apparent from the record, between the Respondent and the Complainant. The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, nor has the Respondent otherwise obtained any authorization to use the Complainant's LOGISTICS CAPITAL PARTNERS Trademark. Moreover, there is no element from which the Panel could infer the Respondent's rights over the Disputed Domain Name under the Policy, or that the Respondent might be commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name.

The Panel is of the opinion that there is no evidence that the Respondent is using the Disputed Domain Name to offer bona fide goods or services or making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. On the contrary, as at the dates of filing of the Complaint and this Decision the Disputed Domain Name resolves to an inactive website.

Also, due to the typosquatting nature of the Disputed Domain Name, its construction is likely to mislead or cause confusion as Internet users may not notice the subtle difference between "captial" and "capital" and may think the Disputed Domain Name may be related to the Complainant, contrary to the fact. The Panel finds that the Respondent's primary intent when registering the Disputed Domain Name was most likely to cause confusion among Internet users.

In light of the above, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. Therefore, the second element of the paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been met by the Complainant.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith in view of the following. The Complainant obtained the registration of the LOGISTICS CAPITAL PARTNERS Trademark almost five years earlier than the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name in 2026. Taking into account all circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that the Respondent was very well aware of the Complainant's business and its LOGISTICS CAPITAL PARTNERS Trademark when registering the confusingly similar Disputed Domain Name that completely incorporates the Complainant's LOGISTICS CAPITAL PARTNERS Trademark and a misspelled version of the "capital" in it. The Panel considers it is obvious bad faith that the Respondent deliberately chose the Disputed Domain Name to create a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's LOGISTICS CAPITAL PARTNERS Trademark and the Complainant's website "www.logisticscapitalpartners.com", so as to create a false association or affiliation with the Complainant.

Moreover, while the Disputed Domain Name resolves to an inactive website, it has been established that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3. Given the Complainant's well-reported involvement and reputation in the real estate industry, the composition of the Disputed Domain Name, such passive holding does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

Furthermore, taking into account that MX records on the server hosting the Disputed Domain Name have been activated suggests that the Disputed Domain Name may be potentially used for email purposes, by means of which the Respondent could solicit personal data (including sensitive personal data) from deceived users of the Complainant's services. Noting the composition of the Disputed Domain Name, the Panel is of the opinion that recipients of any such emails would be under the impression that the emails are associated with or endorsed by the Complainant.

The evidence as presented and the circumstances of the case indicate that the Respondent's aim in registering the Disputed Domain Name was to profit from or exploit the Complainant's LOGISTICS CAPITAL PARTNERS Trademark.

The Panel concludes that the Respondent has registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith.

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 <logisticscaptialpartners.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mariia Koval/
Mariia Koval
Sole Panelist
Date: October 29, 2026