

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Taylor Wessing Limited Liability Partnership v. Name Redacted Case No. D2023-0207

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Taylor Wessing Limited Liability Partnership, United Kingdom, represented by Taylor Wessing LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Name Redacted¹.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <taylorweessing.com> is registered with Google LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 17, 2023. On January 17, 2023, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 17, 2023, 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 (Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 7151571251) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 18, 2023 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 January 18, 2023.

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”).

¹ The Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party when registering the disputed domain name (who appears to be a genuine Partner of the Complainant). 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Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding, and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case.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](#).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 20, 2023. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 9, 2023. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on February 10, 2023.

The Center appointed Tuukka Airaksinen as the sole panelist in this matter on February 15, 2023. 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 global law firm, operating in 17 locations with 1,100 lawyers. The Complainant owns the trademark TAYLOR WESSING, which is registered as a European Union trademark under No. 002727519 as of March 31, 2004.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 15, 2023 and does not currently resolve to an active website but it has been used to send fraudulent emails.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The disputed domain name contains the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, save for the additional letter "e" being inserted in the term "wessing".

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name has been used in an unlawful, fraudulent email scam using the disputed domain name as an email address of an actual member of the Complainant's senior management, alleging to be a "Debt Collection Litigation Counsel" and "chasing an unpaid invoice".

The Complainant has no connection with the Respondent and it is obvious that the email address with the disputed domain name was created by the Respondent to confuse third parties into believing that the Respondent is associated with, or part of, the Complainant in a fraudulent attempt to defraud third parties into transferring funds for the benefit of the Respondent.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In order to obtain the transfer of a domain name, a complainant must prove the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, regardless of whether the respondent files a response to the complaint or not. The first element is that the domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights. The second element a complainant must prove is that the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name. The third element a complainant must establish is that the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy requires that the Complainant establish that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights. Consequently, the Complainant must prove that it has rights to a trademark, and that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to this trademark.

According to section 1.11 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), "[t]he applicable Top Level Domain ('TLD') 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".

Furthermore, "where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. The nature of such additional term(s) may however bear on assessment of the second and third elements". See section 1.8 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark as it includes the Complainant's trademark entirely with the additional letter "e" in the term "wessing". This does not prevent confusing similarity between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name.

This means that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar with the Complainant's trademark and hence the first element of the Policy has been fulfilled.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy requires that the Complainant establish that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests to the disputed domain names.

It is widely accepted among UDRP panels that once a complainant has made a *prima facie* showing indicating the absence of the respondent's rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name the burden of proof shifts to the respondent to come forward with evidence of such rights or legitimate interests. If the respondent fails to do so, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element of the Policy. See, e.g., *Document Technologies, Inc. v. International Electronic Communications Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0270](#), and section 2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

The Complainant has credibly submitted that the Respondent is neither affiliated with the Complainant in any way nor has it been authorized by the Complainant to use and register the disputed domain name, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent has not made and is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name in accordance with paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

The disputed domain name has been used in a fraudulent email scam with the obvious intention of misleading the recipient of the email sent from the disputed domain name in the name of an actual member of the Complainant into transferring funds for the benefit of the Respondent. Therefore, it is difficult to see that the disputed domain name could be put into any legitimate or *bona fide* use.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has made a *prima facie* case that has not been rebutted by the Respondent. Considering the Panel's findings below, the Panel finds that there are no other circumstances that provide the Respondent with any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Therefore, the Panel finds that the second element of the Policy is fulfilled.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy requires that the Complainant establish that the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith. Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy provides that the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith:

“(i) circumstances indicating that [the respondent has] registered or has acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of [the respondent’s] documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or

(ii) [the respondent has] registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that [the respondent has] engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or

(iii) [the respondent has] registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business or competitor; or

(iv) by using the domain name, [the respondent has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent’s] website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the respondent’s] website or location or of a product or service on [the respondent’s] website or location.”

Considering that the Respondent has fraudulently pretended to be an employee of the Complainant, it is obvious that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant or its trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

Considering that the Panel has found that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in an attempt to fraudulently obtain funds for the benefit of the Respondent, the Respondent has not responded to the Complaint, the Respondent has used a privacy service to conceal its identity, there are no obvious good faith or legitimate uses to which the disputed domain name may be put, the Panel considers, on balance, that the disputed domain name has been registered and is used in bad faith.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the third element of the Policy is fulfilled.

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 <taylorweessing.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Tuukka Airaksinen/

Tuukka Airaksinen

Sole Panelist

Date: February 27, 2023