

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lennar Pacific Properties Management, LLC, and Lennar Corporation v. SMG
GVNG, Name Redacted
Case No. DCO2025-0085

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Lennar Pacific Properties Management, LLC (“LPPM”), and Lennar Corporation (“LC”), United States of America (“United States” or “US”), represented by Slates Harwell Campbell, LLP, US.

The Respondent is SMG GVNG, Name Redacted.¹

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lennnar.co> (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 29, 2025. On October 1, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On October 2, 2025, 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 Complainants on October 2, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amendment to the Complaint on October 3, 2025.

¹The Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party as its organization name when registering the Disputed Domain Name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent’s organization name from this decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the organization name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding, and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

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 October 10, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 30, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on October 31, 2025.

The Center appointed Peter J. Dernbach as the sole panelist in this matter on November 6, 2025. 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 Complainants are affiliated companies that engage in real estate management, brokerage, construction, mortgage, and financial services. One of the Complainants, LPPM, holds the following trademark registrations (collectively the “LENNAR Marks”):

- LENNAR, United States trademark registration No. 3108401, registered on June 27, 2006, in connection with real estate management and real estate brokering, financial services, and real estate development and planning services in Classes 35, 36, and 37.

- LENNAR, United States trademark registration No. 3477143, registered on July 29, 2008, in connection with real estate listing, management, and development services, construction services in Classes 36 and 37.

The other Complainant, LC, is authorized to use the LENNAR Marks and owns the domain name <lennar.com> under which it offers its services.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered by the Respondent on September 18, 2025. It resolves to a parking webpage with several pay-per-click links. The Disputed Domain Name has been used for the fraudulent email scheme.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainants

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name. Notably, the Complainants contend that:

(i) The Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainants have rights.

The Complainants assert that the Disputed Domain Name wholly incorporates the Complainants’ LENNAR Marks. The addition of a slight misspelling (an extra “n” in “Lennar”) in the Disputed Domain Name appears to be an obvious or intentional misspelling of the LENNAR Marks, which has been deemed confusingly similar by panels in a number of previous UDRP cases.

(ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name.

The Complainants assert that there is no evidence of the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Disputed Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Nor is there any evidence indicating that the Respondent is commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name or LENNAR Marks.

The Complainants further contend that the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a webpage displaying pay-per-click links, which demonstrates that the Respondent is intentionally attempting to attract or divert Internet users to its website for commercial gain, or to create a false impression of an affiliation or endorsement relationship with the Complainants.

(iii) The Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainants argue that the Respondent concealed its identity, registered the Disputed Domain Name that mimics the Complainants' distinctive and well-known LENNAR Marks, and used it to offer services similar to those of the Complainants, thereby misleading consumers into believing that it is affiliated with the Complainants.

The Complainants further contend that the Respondent used the Disputed Domain Name to impersonate one of the Complainants' employees in an attempt to fraudulently redirect funds, materials, and parts.

Accordingly, the Respondent's conduct constitutes registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainants' contentions.

6. Procedural Issues: Consolidation

When assessing whether a complaint filed by multiple Complainants may be brought against a single Respondent, panels look at whether (i) the Complainants have a specific common grievance against the Respondent, or the Respondent has engaged in common conduct that has affected the Complainants in a similar fashion, and (ii) it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to permit the consolidation. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.11.1.

The Panel notes that one of the Complainants is the owner of the LENNAR Marks and the other Complainant is a licensee of the LENNAR Marks, operating related domain name offering services under the LENNAR Marks. The Panel is satisfied that the Complainants have a specific common grievance against the Respondent and that it would be equitable and procedurally efficient for the proceedings to be consolidated.

Accordingly, the Panel accepts to consolidate the Complainants into one single case against the Respondent.

7. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed in this administrative proceeding and obtain the requested remedy (in this case, transfer of the Disputed Domain Name), the Complainants must prove that each of the three following elements are present:

(i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainants have 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.

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 Complainants' trademark and the Disputed Domain Name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainants' LENNAR Marks, with an additional letter "n" in "lennar." However, numerous UDRP panels have considered that a domain name consisting of a misspelling of the Complainants' trademark (i.e., typosquatting) does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.9. In addition, the Top-Level Domain ".co" is a standard registration requirement and does not impact the assessment of confusing similarity.

Therefore, the Panel finds that 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 the Disputed Domain Name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the Complainants, 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 the Complainants make 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 Complainants). If the Respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the Complainants are deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

The Complainants have asserted that there is no evidence showing that the Respondent has used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Also, there is no indication that the Respondent has ever been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name.

Furthermore, the Disputed Domain Name resolves to a parking webpage displaying multiple pay-per-click links. While the use of parking pages may be permissible in certain circumstances, such use does not, by itself, establish rights or legitimate interests in a domain name, particularly where the Disputed Domain Name was registered with the Complainants' trademark in mind, with the expectation of attracting Internet users searching for the Complainants for commercial gain. This is especially true where the pay-per-click links appearing on the Disputed Domain Name's webpage promote goods or services similar to those offered by the Complainants. Such activity does not confer a right or legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name under the Policy.

Moreover, the Disputed Domain Name has been used for the fraudulent email scheme. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed phishing can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainants have established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainants' prima facie case, nor has it provided any relevant evidence demonstrating

rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name, such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Therefore, 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.

The LENNAR Marks were registered many years before the Disputed Domain Name. There is no evidence to suggest the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name for any reason other than to attract Internet users for commercial gain. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate and presumptively illegal activity, such as phishing, identity theft, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has used the Disputed Domain Name to impersonate one of the Complainants' employees and sent emails to one of the Complainants' vendors requesting wire transfers. Thus, it appears that the Respondent attempted to fraudulently redirect funds. Such conduct demonstrates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainants and their Marks when registering the Disputed Domain Name and intentionally sought to exploit their reputation for illicit gain.

Therefore, the Panel finds the Respondent has registered and used the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith. Thus, the Panel finds that the Complainants have established the third element of the Policy.

8. 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 <lennnar.co> be transferred to the Complainant, Lennar Corporation.

/Peter J. Dernbach/

Peter J. Dernbach

Sole Panelist

Date: November 20, 2025