

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Jones Lang LaSalle IP, Inc. v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2024-1559

1. The Parties

Complainant is Jones Lang LaSalle IP, Inc., United States of America, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

Respondent is Name Redacted¹, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The Disputed Domain Name <jll-am-us.com> is registered with IONOS SE (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 12, 2024. On April 12, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On April 15, 2024, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on April 18, 2024, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on April 23, 2024.

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 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 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 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Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding, and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case.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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on April 26, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 16, 2024. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on May 23, 2024.

The Center appointed Michael A. Albert as the sole panelist in this matter on May 31, 2024. 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

Jones Lang LaSalle IP, Inc. ("Complainant"), is the owner of the below trademark registrations across various jurisdictions.

TRADEMARK JURISDICTION/	TM OFFICE	REGISTRATION NUMBER	REGISTRATION DATE	IC CLASS
JLL	United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO")	4564654	July 8, 2014	035
JLL	USPTO	4709457	March 24, 2015	036
JLL	Canadian Intellectual Property Office ("CIPO")	TMA875711	April 15, 2014	035, 036, 037, 042
JLL	United Kingdom Intellectual Property office ("UKIPO")	UK00910603447	August 31, 2012	036, 037, 042
JLL	European Union Trade Mark ("EUTM")	010603447	August 31, 2012	036, 037, 042
JONES LANG LASALLE (JLL)	EUTM	011014065	December 4, 2012	035, 036, 037, 042

Headquartered in Chicago, Illinois, United States of America, the JLL group is a professional services and investment management firm specializing in real estate. Its regional headquarters for the Americas, EMEA and Asia Pacific businesses are located in Chicago, London and Singapore, respectively. The JLL group was formed by the merger of Jones Lang Wootton and LaSalle Partners in 1999 in what was the largest international merger in the real estate industry at the time. Since 2014, Complainant has officially marketed itself under the name "JLL."

The JLL group is an industry leader in property and corporate facility management services, with a portfolio of 5 billion square feet worldwide. With a workforce of approximately 91,000 the JLL group serves clients in over 80 countries from more than 300 corporate office locations worldwide. In 2020, the JLL group reported a revenue of USD 16.6 billion.

JLL group is the winner of numerous awards and accolades. In 2015, JLL achieved Fortune 500 status and is recognized by Fortune Magazine as one of the "World's Most Admired Companies" in 2021 for the sixth consecutive year. JLL was named one of the "World's Most Ethical Companies" by the Ethisphere Institute, for the 14th consecutive year (2021) since 2008. The JLL group has a large Internet presence and is the owner of numerous domain names that incorporate the JLL trademark, including <jll.com> and <joneslanglasalle.com>. It maintains 100 websites globally and in 2015, acquired the rights to use the dot-jll (.jll) and dot-lasalle (.lasalle) top level domain names. According to Similarweb.com, Complainant's websites

at its primary domain names <jll.com> and <joneslanglasalle.com> received 1.19 million and 86.91K visitors during the period of February 2021 to July 2021, respectively.

Complainant further utilizes its JLL trademark a variety of Domain Names and subdomain names in conjunction with its operations. Specifically, Complainant operates from <us.jll.com> and uses @am.jll.com for email.

Complainant has also registered various domain names using the JLL trademark in county-code top level domain (ccTLDs), enabling users access to Complainant's service with information specific to their region.

- <jll.co.uk>
- <jll.com.au>
- <jll.co.in>
- <jll.be>
- <jll.eu>

In addition to its numerous domain names and websites, the JLL group has a strong social media presence through the use of its Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn pages. Its X (formerly Twitter) page has over 75,100 followers while its Facebook page has over 131,000 "likes" and its LinkedIn page has over 729,000 followers.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on December 14, 2023, and redirects Internet users to Complainant's official website.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name.

Notably, Complainant contends that the Disputed Domain Name captures, in its entirety, Complainant's JLL trademark, with Respondent having only added the letters "am" and "us" to the Complainant's JLL trademark, thereby making the Disputed Domain Name confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark. The fact that such added terms are closely linked and associated with Complainant's brand and trademark only serves to underscore and increase the confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the Complainant's trademark.

Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with Complainant in any way. Complainant has not given Respondent permission to use Complainant's trademarks in any manner, including in domain names. Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, which evinces a lack of rights or legitimate interests.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered in bad faith. By registering a domain name that comprises the Complainant's JLL trademark in its entirety in conjunction with terms directly related to Complainant, Respondent has created a domain name that is confusingly similar to Complainant's trademark, as well as to its <jll.com> domain and <us.jll.com> and <am.jll.com> subdomains. As such, Respondent has demonstrated a knowledge of and familiarity with Complainant's brand and business. Moreover, Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name to redirect to Complainant's own website further reinforces the Respondent's knowledge of the Complainant's JLL trademark at the time of registration.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions or cease and desist letters.

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 Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

Here, Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel further finds the mark is recognizable within the Disputed Domain Name. The addition of the term "am" (often associated with "America") and "us" (often associated with "United States") does not eliminate such similarity or the associated likelihood of confusion between the Disputed Domain Name and Complainant's JLL mark.

Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds Complainant has established the first element of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which 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 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. Respondent has not rebutted Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel finds Complainant has established the second element of the Policy.

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 Respondent utilizes the Disputed Domain Name to redirect Internet users to Complainant's official website, thus creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant and its trademarks. Internet users landing on the Disputed Domain Name's website would reasonably believe the

Domain Name is controlled by or connected to Complainant, particularly given that the Disputed Domain Name uses Complainant's well-known mark, with the addition only of generic abbreviations.

Such use is evidence of bad faith as it deprives Complainant of control over a domain name likely to be associated with Complainant and its trademark. See, e.g., *GameStop, Inc. v. Above.com Domain Privacy /Protection Domain*, WIPO Case No. [D2018-1243](#), (finding bad faith where Respondent's conduct causes "Internet traffic to redirect to a website that is not that of, or associated with, Complainant"). Indeed, the Disputed Domain Name is currently set up with mail exchanger (MX) records, showing that the Disputed Domain Name may be actively used for email purposes. Emails emanating from the Disputed Domain Name could not reasonably be used for any good faith purpose by Respondent, given that such emails would appear to emanate from Complainant. Consequently, and absent any explanation from Respondent, it is reasonable to conclude that the intended use of the Disputed Domain Name for email is to facilitate fraudulent activity such as phishing, impersonating or passing off as Complainant.

The Panel finds that 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 <jll-am-us.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Michael A. Albert/

Michael A. Albert

Sole Panelist

Date: June 14, 2024