

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Jones Lang LaSalle IP, Inc. v. Name Redacted¹
Case No. D2022-1657

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Jones Lang LaSalle IP, Inc., United States of America (“US”), represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Name Redacted, Australia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <apjll.com> is registered with Wild West Domains, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 6, 2022. On May 6, 2022, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 6, 2022, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 May 9, 2022. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5,

¹ The Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent’s 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 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Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding, and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case.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 due date for Response was May 29, 2022. The Respondent did not submit any response, however the Center received an informal communication email on May 17, 2022, from an email address which is not confirmed by the Registrar, signed by the name to be the Registrar-confirmed Respondent. Accordingly, the Center notified the commencement of panel appointment process on May 30, 2022.

The Center appointed George R. F. Souter as the sole panelist in this matter on June 2, 2022. 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, a US corporation, is a professional services and investment management firm, specializing in real estate. Since 2014, it has traded under its JLL trademark. The Complainant's portfolio of property and corporate facility management services is about five billion square-foot worldwide. It has a workforce of approximately 91,000, the Complainant services clients in over 80 countries from more than 300 corporate office locations worldwide. The Complainant's turnover in 2020 was USD 6.1 billion.

Details of registrations of the Complainant's JLL trademark have been supplied to the Panel. These include US registration number 4564654, registered on July 8, 2014, and Australian registration number 1471865, registered on January 31, 2012.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 20, 2021, and currently resolves to a blank page.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its JLL trademark, containing its JLL trademark in its entirety, together with merely descriptive or non distinctive elements, namely a prefix "ap", and an extra terminal "l". The Complainant contends that the "ap" prefix is a common geographical abbreviation for "Asia Pacific".

The Complainant alleges that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent has never received permission from the Complainant to use its JLL trademark in connection with a domain name registration, or otherwise.

The Complainant alleges that the Respondent is not generally known by the disputed domain name, and the Respondent is making no attempt to use the disputed domain name for legitimate purposes. Indeed, the Complainant alleges that the Respondent is doing the opposite, and has drawn the Panels attention to an attempt to use the disputed domain name to insinuate that the email address linked to the disputed domain name emanated from the Complainant. The Complainant submits that it sent multiple cease and desist letters to the Respondent, however the Respondent did not reply.

The Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith, and is being used in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy lists three elements that the Complainant must prove to merit a finding that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant:

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

The Panel finds that the Complainant has trademark rights to its JLL trademark for the purposes of these proceedings, and recognizes that the Complainant's extensive use of its JLL trademark will have resulted in the Complainant having acquired significant common law rights to its JLL trademark.

It is well established in prior decisions under the UDRP, with which the Panel agrees, that a generic Top-Level-Domain ("gTLD") may generally be disregarded when comparing a trademark with a disputed domain name. The Panel considers the gTLD ".com" to be irrelevant in the circumstances of the present case, and finds that it may be disregarded here.

The Complainant's JLL trademark is clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name, rendering the disputed domain name confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark, and the additional elements in the disputed domain name do not detract from this finding. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy in connection with the disputed domain name at issue.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

It is the consensus view of UDRP panels, with which the Panel agrees, that a *prima facie* case advanced by the complainant will generally be sufficient for the complainant to be deemed to have satisfied the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, provided the respondent does not come forward with evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name and the complainant has presented a sufficient *prima facie* case to succeed under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

The Respondent did not advance any claim of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name to rebut this *prima facie* case.

Furthermore, the nature of the disputed domain name, incorporating the Complainant's well-known JLL trademark, carries a risk of implied affiliation. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 2.5.1.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy, in connection with the disputed domain name.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel is of the view that the finding that a respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name can lead, in appropriate circumstances, to a finding of registration of a disputed domain name in bad faith. The circumstance of the present case, in which the Panel regards it as self-evident that the Complainant's JLL trademark was deliberately appropriated in the disputed domain name are such that the Panel concludes that a finding of registration in bad faith is justified, in connection with the disputed domain name and so finds.

It is well established in prior decisions under the Policy, since the decision in *Telstra Corporation Limited v.*

Nuclear Marshmallows, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#), that the non-use of a disputed domain name does not preclude a finding of use in bad faith if a complainant has a legitimate concern that any commencement of use of a disputed domain name would be likely to damage its legitimate commercial interests. In the circumstances of the present case, the Panel considers that the Complainant has a legitimate concern in this regard, and finds that the disputed domain name is being used in bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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, <apjll.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/George R. F. Souter/

George R. F. Souter

Sole Panelist

Date: June 16, 2022