ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Latham & Watkins LLP v. k kk
Case No. D2026-4044

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Latham & Watkins LLP, United States of America ("USA" or "United States"), represented by Latham & Watkins LLP, United States.

The Respondent is k kk, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lathamwatkinsi.one> (the "Domain Name") is registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 9, 2026. On September 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On September 10, 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 ("Redacted for Privacy, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot") and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 10, 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 14, 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 Wolter Wefers Bettink as the sole panelist in this matter on October 19, 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 was founded in 1934 in Los Angeles, USA and has over 3,500 attorneys in thirty offices located in fourteen countries. It is ranked among the best law firms in the world in leading legal publications such as The American Lawyer, MergerMarket, and Chambers and Partners.

The Complainant holds, inter alia, the following trade marks (the "Trade Marks"):

- United States trade mark LATHAM & WATKINS registered under No. 2413795 on December 19, 2000.
- United States trade mark LATHAM & WATKINS registered under No. 4986824 on June 28, 2016.
- United States trade mark LATHAM & WATKINS registered under No. 4976906 on June 14, 2016.
- United States trade mark LATHAM & WATKINS registered under No. 4968228 on May 31, 2016.

The Domain Name was registered on April 29, 2026, and apparently resolved to a website, featuring the Complainant's Trade Mark, offering legal services to recover money from scammers who have swindled persons out of cryptocurrency. The website listed a "lawyer team" comprised of individuals who are actual attorneys at the Complainant, but not part of the Respondent's organization, displaying photos of these lawyers that were taken from the Complainant's website under "lw.com".

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 Domain Name, on the grounds set out below.

The Domain Name is nearly identical or confusingly similar to the Trade Marks, as it contains the entire LATHAM & WATKINS Trade Mark, with the omission of the ampersand. The Respondent's use of the Domain Name will cause clients and others in the legal industry to mistakenly believe that the Domain Name is affiliated with the Complainant. The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

First, the Respondent has never received the Complainant's authorization, license, consent, or permission to use the Trade Marks or to register the Domain Name, and it has not entered into any relationship with the Complainant.

Second, the Respondent cannot claim any legitimate rights to the Domain Name absent some relationship to the Complainant because the strong and famous LATHAM & WATKINS Trade Mark has no other meaning but to identify the Complainant and its services. The Respondent's only use of the Domain Name is to misleadingly confuse and defraud clients in the legal industry, and to trade off the Trade Marks and the trust and goodwill associated with the Complainant and the Trade Marks.

Third, the Respondent's contact, administrative, and technical information from the Registrar's WHOIS database printout does not reveal any rights or interest in the Domain Name or in any way indicates the Respondent is commonly known by the Trade Marks.

Fourth, the Respondent's only known use of the Domain Name was to host a website impersonating the Complainant and offering legal services to recover money from scammers who have swindled persons out of cryptocurrency. The website even claimed to have a "lawyer team" comprised of individuals who are actual

attorneys at the Complainant, but not part of the Respondent's organization, while using actual photos of these lawyers that were taken directly from the Complainant's website under <lw.com> without the Complainant's or the lawyers' permission and in violation of the Copyright Act, as well as the relevant terms of use.

The Respondent registered and uses the Domain Name in bad faith for three reasons. First, the Domain Name incorporates wholesale the Trade Mark LATHAM & WATKINS and therefore can only sensibly refer to the Complainant and there is no obvious possible justification for the Respondent's selection of the Domain Name other than bad faith.

Second, the Respondent's knowing violations of the Trade Marks is per se a bad-faith registration and use of the Trade Marks, given it intentionally used the LATHAM & WATKINS Trade Mark to impersonate the Complainant. Thus, it is unfathomable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's rights in the Trade Marks.

Third, the Respondent used the Domain Name to impersonate the Complainant and purportedly offer legal services that are similar to the services actually offered by the Complainant.

This, by itself, reveals bad faith. Finally, the Respondent's use of a proxy service further evidences bad faith. For all these reasons, the Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not respond to the Complaint.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has shown that it has registered rights in the Trade Marks. The Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Trade Marks as it incorporates the LATHAM & WATKINS Trade Mark in its entirety, but without the ampersand and with an "i" added at the end. The omission of the ampersand and the addition of the letter "i" do not avoid a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the Trade Marks (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.8; see also, inter alia, *TPI Holdings, Inc. v. Carmen Armengol*, WIPO Case No. D2009-0361, and *F. Hoffmann-La Roche AG v. John Mercier*, WIPO Case No. D2018-0980). The generic Top-Level-Domain ("gTLD") ".one" is typically disregarded under the confusing similarity test, since it is a technical registration requirement (WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1).

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Trade Marks in which the Complainant has rights.

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 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.

Based on the evidence and the undisputed submissions of the Complainant, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has not received the Complainant's authorization or consent to use the Trade Marks as part of the Domain Name, is not commonly known by the Domain Name, and has not acquired trade mark rights in the Domain Name. In addition, the Respondent's use of the Domain Name does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services. It apparently resolved to a website incorporating the LATHAM & WATKINS Trade Mark, offering legal services similar to those offered by the Complainant and posting (without consent) names and images of lawyers working at the Complainant (but not at the Respondent). The Complainant did not submit a complete screenshot of the website, but its contentions as to the contents of the website remained undisputed, as the Respondent did not file a Response. By operating a website under the Domain Name with this content, the Respondent created the false impression of a relationship with or authorization by the Complainant and misled Internet users into believing the website was associated with or approved by the Complainant.

In view of the above, the Panel concludes that the Complainant has established that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name.

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. This list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, leaves open that other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

Based on the undisputed information and the evidence provided by the Complainant, the Panel finds that at the time of registration of the Domain Name the Respondent was or should have been aware of the Complainant's Trade Marks, since:

- the registration of the Domain Name occurred some 26 years after the registration of the earliest of the Trade Marks;
- the LATHAM&WATKINS name is not a name of which it is likely that the Respondent thought of spontaneously when registering the Domain Name;
- the Complainant is a well-known law firm and on the website to which the Domain Name resolved legal services were offered;
- a simple trade mark register search, or even an Internet search, prior to registration of the Domain Name would have informed the Respondent of the existence of the Trade Marks.

With regard to bad faith use, the Panel finds that the following circumstances together are found to be indicative of bad faith use of the Domain Name:

- the probability that the Respondent was aware or should have been aware of the Complainant's rights in the Trade Marks;
- the use of the Domain Name to resolve to a website apparently incorporating the LATHAM & WATKINS Trade Mark, offering legal services and posting (without consent) names and images of lawyers working at the Complainant (but not at the Respondent), thereby creating the false impression of a relationship with or authorization by the Complainant and misleading customers into believing the website was associated with or approved by the Complainant;
- the lack of a Response from the Respondent;
- the hiding by the Respondent of its identity through the use of a proxy domain service.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Domain Name has been registered and is being used 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 <lathamwatkinsi.one> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Wolter Wefers Bettink/
Wolter Wefers Bettink
Sole Panelist
Date: October 28, 2026