

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ares Management LLC v. Mayang Mayang
Case No. D2024-4444

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Ares Management LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Greenberg Traurig, LLP, United States .

The Respondent is Mayang Mayang, Malaysia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <arescapitalgrop.com> (the “Domain Name”) is registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 29, 2024. On October 30, 2024, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On October 31, 2024, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 31, 2024, 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 amended Complaint on November 1, 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”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 1, 2024. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 21, 2024. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 22, 2024.

The Center appointed Nicholas Smith as the sole panelist in this matter on December 10, 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

Since 1997, the Complainant and its various related entities and predecessor-in-title have offered financial services (specifically asset management services) under the trademarks ARES (the "ARES Mark"), ARES CAPITAL and a logo mark featuring the word "Ares". The Complainant promotes its goods and services through various means including from its websites at "www.aresmgmt.com" and "www.arescapitalcorp.com".

The Complainant has held trademark registrations for each of the ARES Mark, ARES CAPITAL and a logo mark featuring the word "Ares" in the United States since 2011. Specifically, the Complainant is the owner of Registration No. 3,014,171 for the ARES Mark, registered on November 8, 2005, for investment management services in class 36.

The Domain Name was registered on October 11, 2024. The Domain Name is presently inactive but prior to the commencement of the proceeding resolved to a website (the "Respondent's Website") that prominently reproduces the ARES Mark and the logo mark. The Respondent's Website purports to provide competing financial services and invites visitors to log into their user account and provide the Respondent with their personal information and passwords which could be used to allow the Respondent to access any accounts visitors hold with the Complainant and commit fraud.

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 Domain Name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

- a) It is the owner of the ARES Mark, having registered the ARES Mark in the United States. The Domain Name is confusingly similar to the ARES Mark as it reproduces the ARES Mark in its entirety and adds the (misspelled and descriptive) terms "capital grop".
- b) There are no rights or legitimate interests held by the Respondent in respect of the Domain Name. The Complainant has not granted any license or authorization for the Respondent to use the ARES Mark. The Respondent is not commonly known by the ARES Mark, nor does it use the Domain Name for a bona fide purpose or legitimate noncommercial purpose. Rather the Respondent is using the Domain Name to pass off as the Complainant for commercial gain as part of a phishing scheme. Such use is not a legitimate use of the Domain Name.
- c) The Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent is using the Domain Name to divert Internet users searching for the Complainant to the Respondent's Website for commercial gain and to potentially steal their passwords and other personal information. Such conduct amounts to registration and use of the Domain Name in bad faith.

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 Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

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

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

Although the addition of other terms here, "capital grop" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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 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 the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the 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 Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel considers that the record of this case reflects that:

- Before any notice to the Respondent of the dispute, the Respondent did not use, nor has it made demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Name or a name corresponding to the Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.2.
- The Respondent (as an individual, business, or other organization) has not been commonly known by the Domain Name. Paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.3.
- The Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue. Paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.4.

- The record contains no other factors demonstrating rights or legitimate interests of the Respondent in the Domain Name.

The Respondent's use of the Domain Name to resolve to a webpage reproducing the Complainant's ARES Mark and related logo, purporting to allow visitors to "log in" to their account, does not amount to use for a bona fide offering of goods and services. Rather, it appears that the purpose behind the Respondent's Website is to encourage visitors, under the impression that they are dealing with the Complainant, to provide their personal details and passwords to the Respondent to enable the Respondent to commit some sort of fraud. Such conduct is phishing, which is not a bona fide offering of goods or services.

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 Panel considers that the record of this case reflects that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its web site 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 web site or location. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here being phishing, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the Domain Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Respondent's Website reproduces the Complainant's ARES Mark and related logo and purports to provide visitors, under the impression that they are dealing with an official website of the Complainant, with the opportunity to provide their account details and passwords. However, what apparently occurs is that the Respondent uses the Respondent's Website to steal the passwords of visitors misled into visiting the Respondent's Website for the purposes of logging into their accounts with the Complainant and committing fraud. Such conduct is deceptive, and in previous UDRP decisions has been found to be evidence of registration and use in bad faith, see *FIL Limited v. Withheld for Privacy Purposes, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf / Mark Steven*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-3284](#).

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 Domain Name <arescapitalgrop.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nicholas Smith/

Nicholas Smith

Sole Panelist

Date: December 13, 2024