

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lennar Pacific Properties Management, LLC and Lennar Corporation v. emily traders

Case No. DCC2026-0011

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Lennar Pacific Properties Management, LLC and Lennar Corporation, United States of America (henceforth referred both together as “the Complainant”), represented by Slates Harwell Campbell, LLP, United States of America (“United States”).

The Respondent is emily traders, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lennar.cc> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 20, 2026. On April 21, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 21, 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 ehf”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 22, 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 April 22, 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 April 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 13, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Nayiri Boghossian as the sole panelist in this matter on May 22, 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 a real estate services company and owns various trademark registrations for LENNAR such as:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 3108401, registered on June 27, 2006;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 3477143, registered on July 29, 2008.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 4, 2026, and redirects to the Complainant's 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 is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark in full adding the top-level domain ("TLD") ".cc".

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not used or prepared to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name does not constitute a legitimate noncommercial or fair use as the disputed domain name redirects to Complainant's website.

The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name combined with (1) the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, (2) the Respondent's failure to respond to Complainant's cease and desist correspondence or provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, and (3) the Respondent's concealing of its identity or use of false contact information supports a finding that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith. Additionally, the disputed domain name redirects to the Complainant's own website.

B. Respondent

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

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 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 entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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.

Furthermore, the Panel finds that the nature of the disputed domain name carries a high risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name was registered 20 years after the registration of the Complainant's trademark and it redirected to the Complainant's website. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew of the Complainant (noting also that the disputed domain name redirects to the Complainant's own website) at the time of registration of the disputed domain name.

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.

The Panel finds that by using the disputed domain name for redirection to the Complainant's official website, the Respondent has used and is holding the disputed domain name in bad faith, which constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy. Noting the high risk of implied affiliation arising from the identity of the disputed domain name with the Complainant's trademark, the Respondent's control over the disputed domain name is a hanging threat over the Complainant as the misleading nature of the disputed domain name is enhanced with the redirection to the Complainant's website.

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 <lennar.cc> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nayiri Boghossian/

Nayiri Boghossian

Sole Panelist

Date: June 1, 2026