ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
LLOYD Lifestyle GmbH v. Lauren Rhodes, Evan Fraser, and Finlay Greenwood
Case No. D2026-2157

1. The Parties

The Complainant is LLOYD Lifestyle GmbH, Germany, represented by Bird & Bird LLP, Germany.

The Respondents are Lauren Rhodes, Germany, Evan Fraser, Italy, and Finlay Greenwood, Italy.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <lloyddeutschland.com>, <lloydhungary.com>, and <lloydisrael.com> are registered with Paknic (Private) Limited (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 19, 2026. On May 19, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On May 20, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Whois Agent / Web Domains By Proxy Ltd) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 22, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed amendments to the Complaint on May 27, 2026, and June 8, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendments 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 June 11, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 1, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 2, 2026.

The Center appointed Rodrigo Azevedo as the sole panelist in this matter on July 7, 2026. 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.

The Center received a supplemental submission by the Complainant on July 14, 2026.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a German company engaged in the manufacture and worldwide sale of footwear and related products, including bags, wallets, and clothing.

The Complainant states that it has used the LLOYD trademark since 1905 and markets its products through retail stores and online at its principal domain name <lloyd.com>, registered on September 18, 1991.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for LLOYD, including:

- German Trademark Registration No. 662151, registered on September 3, 1954;
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 000043810, registered on October 2, 1998; and
- International Trademark Registration No. 1106759, registered on November 7, 2011;

The disputed domain name <lloyddeutschland.com> was registered on July 24, 2023. The disputed domain names <lloydisrael.com> and <lloydhungary.com> were registered on July 25, 2023.

The Registrar disclosed Lauren Rhodes as the registrant of <lloyddeutschland.com>, Evan Fraser as the registrant of <lloydhungary.com>, and Finlay Greenwood as the registrant of <lloydisrael.com>.

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the disputed domain names resolved to websites presented as national LLOYD online stores for Germany, Hungary, and Israel. The websites reproduced the Complainant's trademark and offered purported LLOYD footwear and other goods for sale. The Complainant alleges that the websites were unauthorized online stores offering counterfeit products.

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 disputed domain names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

(i) The disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant asserts that it owns longstanding registered rights in the LLOYD trademark and has used the trademark since 1905. The disputed domain names each reproduce the LLOYD trademark in its entirety. The addition of the geographical terms "israel", "deutschland", meaning Germany, and "hungary" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. Rather, according to the Complainant, those terms may lead Internet users to believe that the disputed domain names correspond to the Complainant's official national websites for Israel, Germany, and Hungary. The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" does not distinguish the disputed domain names from the Complainant's trademark.

(ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Complainant contends that it has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use the LLOYD trademark or to register the disputed domain names. The Complainant further states that it has never had any business relationship with the Respondent. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names and is not using them in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or for a legitimate noncommercial or fair purpose. Instead, the disputed domain names falsely suggest an affiliation with the Complainant and are used to take advantage of the reputation and goodwill associated with the LLOYD trademark.

(iii) The disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with knowledge of the Complainant and its LLOYD trademark. In the Complainant's view, the incorporation of the trademark together with geographical terms referring to markets in which consumers would expect the Complainant to operate demonstrates that the disputed domain names were deliberately selected to target the Complainant. The disputed domain names have been used for unauthorized online stores offering counterfeit LLOYD goods. Through this use, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark, business, and official website. The Complainant also relies on the use of a privacy service, allegedly inaccurate registrant information, the reputation and distinctiveness of the LLOYD trademark, and the asserted absence of any plausible good-faith use of the disputed domain names as further evidence of bad-faith registration and use.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Consolidation of domain names in one proceeding

The amendments to the Complaint were filed against three nominally different registrants in relation to the disputed domain names <lloyddeutschland.com>, <lloydhungary.com>, and <lloydisrael.com>. The Complainant requests that the disputes be consolidated in a single proceeding on the basis that the disputed domain names are subject to common control. The Respondents did not challenge the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules provides that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain-name holder. Pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules, the Panel shall decide a request to consolidate multiple domain name disputes in accordance with the Policy and the Rules.

Where a complaint is filed against multiple respondents, panels look at whether (i) the domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control, and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all parties. Procedural efficiency would also underpin panel consideration of such a consolidation scenario. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.11.2.

The circumstances of the present case support a finding of common control. All three disputed domain names were registered with the same Registrar within a period of two days: <lloyddeutschland.com> on July 24, 2023, and <lloydhungary.com> and <lloydisrael.com> on July 25, 2023. Each disputed domain name follows the same composition pattern, consisting of the Complainant's LLOYD trademark followed by the name of a country.

Moreover, the disputed domain names were used in connection with substantially similar websites presented as national LLOYD online stores and reproducing the Complainant's trademark and commercial presentation. The contact information associated with all three disputed domain names also includes the same email address, namely "[…]@sgawsw.shop", notwithstanding the different registrant names disclosed by the Registrar.

Taken together, the closely coordinated registration dates, the uniform naming pattern, the same Registrar, the substantially similar website content and purpose, and the shared contact email address are sufficient to establish, on the balance of probabilities, that the disputed domain names are subject to common control.

The Panel also sees no reason why consolidation would be unfair or inequitable to any Party. On the contrary, consolidation avoids unnecessary duplication and promotes procedural efficiency.

Accordingly, the Panel accepts the Complainant's consolidation request and will refer to the nominally different registrants collectively as the "Respondent" throughout the remainder of this Decision.

6.2 Merits

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that in order to be entitled to a transfer of the disputed domain name, a complainant shall prove the following three elements:

(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

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 disputed domain names. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The trademark LLOYD is wholly encompassed within the disputed domain names, together with the respective suffixes "deutschland", "hungary", and "israel", as well as with the gTLD ".com". Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of geographic terms (here, "deutschland", "hungary", and "israel") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that such additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, 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 that 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 3.1, 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 disputed domain names. 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 disputed domains name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Complainant has not licensed nor authorized the use of its famous trademark to the Respondent, and the Panel finds no indication that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names.

Furthermore, the Complainant has shown that the disputed domain names resolved to websites reproducing the Complainant's LLOYD trademark and company name, and purportedly offering for sale products identified with the Complainant's trademark. However, according to the Complainant, the Respondent is not an authorized service provider, nor has obtained any permission for such use of trademark. Such use cannot be considered as a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1.

The Panel concludes that it is not feasible that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant's trademark and that the registration of the disputed domain names was a mere coincidence.

Annex C-5 to the Complaint shows registrations for the LLOYD trademark obtained by the Complainant as early as in 1954. When the disputed domain names were registered (in 2023), the LLOYD trademark was already connected with the Complainant's footwear and related products.

The disputed domain names include the famous trademark LLOYD in its entirety, just adding the terms "deutschland", "hungary", and "israel". In fact, the adoption of the geographic terms "Deutschland", "Hungary", and "Israel" amplifies the potential for confusion in the present case, suggesting that the websites at the disputed domain names are official distribution channels for the Complainant's products respectively in Germany, Hungary, and Israel.

Furthermore, according to the WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4, UDRP panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a famous or widely known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith.

The Panel notes that the content of the websites at the disputed domain names - including reproductions of the Complainant's trademark and products - makes it clear that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract the Complainant's customers, for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the respective websites.

Finally, the absence of any justification for the use of the Complainant's trademark further supports the finding of bad faith in the present case. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

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 names <lloyddeutschland.com>, <lloydhungary.com> and <lloydisrael.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Rodrigo Azevedo /
Rodrigo Azevedo
Sole Panelist
Date: July 21, 2026