

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

LLOYD Lifestyle GmbH v. Jan Fenstermacher, Karolin Faust, Antje Jung,  
Jennifer Weber, Ulrike Wulf  
Case No. D2025-1544

### **1. The Parties**

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

Respondents are Jan Fenstermacher, Germany, Karolin Faust, Germany, Antje Jung, Germany, Jennifer Weber, Germany, and Ulrike Wulf, Germany.

### **2. The Domain Names and Registrar**

The disputed domain names <lloyd-australia.com> (“disputed domain name No. 1”), <lloyd-deutschland.com> (“disputed domain name No. 2”), <lloyd-polska.com> (“disputed domain name No. 3”), <lloyd-turkiye.com> (“disputed domain name No. 4”), and <lloydzapatatos.com> (“disputed domain name No. 5”) are registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 16, 2025. On April 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On April 17, 2025, 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 (Super Privacy Service Ltd) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on April 22, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting Complainant to either file separate complaints 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. Complainant filed amendments to the Complaint on April 24 and May 1, 2025.

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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 5, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 25, 2025. Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondents' default on June 1, 2025.

The Center appointed Stephanie G. Hartung as the sole panelist in this matter on June 6, 2025. 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**

Complainant is a company organized under the laws of Germany whose business is the production and sale of shoes, bags, wallets, and clothing worldwide through stationary retail stores as well as online.

Complainant has provided evidence that it is the registered owner of numerous trademarks relating to its company name and brand LLOYD, including, but not limited to, the following:

- word trademark LLOYD, German Patent and Trade Mark Office, registration number: 662151, registration date: September 3, 1954, status: active; and
- word/device trademark LLOYD, European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO), registration number: 000043810, registration date: October 2, 1998, status: active.

Moreover, Complainant has demonstrated to own the domain name <lloyd.com>, which resolves to Complainant's official website at "www.lloyd.com", used to promote Complainant's products and related services internationally.

Respondents, according to the registrar verification, are located in Germany, too. The disputed domain names Nos. 1 and 2 were both registered on April 25, 2024, followed by the disputed domain names Nos. 3 and 4, which were both registered on May 30, 2024, and preceded by the disputed domain name No. 5 registered on April 18, 2024. Since the operator of the websites to which the disputed domain names resolve appears to use geo-blocking services, at the time of drafting this Decision access to those websites has been denied. Complainant, however, has demonstrated that at some point before the filing of the Complaint, each of the disputed domain names resolved to a website used to operate an online shop where purported Complainant's goods were sold, thereby prominently displaying Complainant's LLOYD trademark and imitating the look and feel of Complainant's official LLOYD website.

Complainant requests that the disputed domain names be transferred to Complainant.

#### **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 names. Notably, Complainant contends to be one of the most well-known German shoe manufacturers, using the LLOYD trademark already since 1905, which has meanwhile acquired a fairly high degree of distinctiveness and reputation.

Complainant submits that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to Complainant's LLOYD trademark, as they completely reproduce the latter, with the added terms "australia", "deutschland", "polska", "turkiye", and "zapatos" (the Spanish term for "shoes") being clearly descriptive. Moreover, Complainant asserts that Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names

since (1) Complainant has not granted any license or authorization of any other kind to Respondents to use its LLOYD trademark, and there has never been any kind of business relationship between the Parties, (2) the disputed domain names falsely suggest an affiliation with Complainant, and (3) it is obvious that Respondents are simply trying to take advantage of Complainant's good reputation in its field of business with the intention to create confusion among the Internet users for Respondents' own benefit. Finally, Complainant argues that Respondents have registered and are using the disputed domain names in bad faith since (1) they are used to operate fake online shops where counterfeits of Complainant's products were sold, (2) the look and feel of the websites under the disputed domain names is also similar to that of the website operated by Complainant, and (3) Complainant's LLOYD trademark enjoys a fairly high degree of distinctiveness and reputation, and it is implausible to think of any good faith of Respondents when registering and/or using the disputed domain names.

## **B. Respondents**

Respondents did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, Complainant carries the burden of proving:

- (i) that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) that Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

Respondents' default in the case at hand does not automatically result in a decision in favor of Complainant, however, paragraph 5(f) of the Rules provides that if Respondents do not submit a response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute solely based upon the Complaint. Further, according to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences from Respondents' failure to submit a Response as it considers appropriate.

### **A. Consolidation due to multitude of Respondents**

As regards the multitude of Respondents and disputed domain names belonging to them, the Panel notes that (1) all disputed domain names were registered through the same Registrar and in a close temporal context, namely between April 18, 2024, and May 30, 2024, (2) all disputed domain names belong to underlying registrants apparently located in Germany, (3) all disputed domain names follow an almost identical naming pattern, as they comprise the entirety of Complainant's LLOYD trademark, followed either by a geographical term such as "australia" etc., or by a dictionary term such as "zapatos" (the Spanish term for "shoes"), and (4) all disputed domain names have been used in a similar way (see Section 4 above). Therefore, it is reasonable to argue that all disputed domain names are subject to some kind of common control which is why it is fair and equitable to all Parties that this Complaint is consolidated against multiple Respondents at the same time. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.11.2.

Having said so, the Panel comes to the following finding:

### **B. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

First, 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 LLOYD trademark and the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of its LLOYD trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of such trademark is reproduced within all disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to Complainant's LLOYD trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. Although the addition of other terms (here, geographical terms such as "australia" etc., or a dictionary term such as "zapatos" (the Spanish term for "shoes")) 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 disputed domain names and Complainant's LLOYD trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel, therefore, holds the first element of the Policy has been established.

### **C. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Second, paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which Respondents 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 Respondents lack rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. Respondents have not rebutted Complainant's prima facie showing and have not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

In particular, Respondents have not been authorized to use Complainant's LLOYD trademark, either as a domain name or in any other way. Also, there is no reason to believe that Respondents' names somehow correspond with the disputed domain names and Respondents do not appear to have any trademark rights associated with the term "lloyd" on their own. Quite to the contrary, each of the disputed domain names resolved at some point before the filing of the Complaint to a website used to operate an online shop where purported Complainant's goods were sold, thereby prominently displaying Complainant's LLOYD trademark and imitating the look and feel of Complainant's official website, without any authorization to do so. Complainant contends – and Respondents have not rebutted such contention – that those products are counterfeit. Such use of the disputed domain names, therefore, qualifies neither as bona fide nor as legitimate noncommercial or fair use within the meaning of the Policy. In this context, UDRP panels have long held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, the alleged sale of counterfeit products) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1. Also, the layout of Respondents' websites creates a likelihood of confusion to Internet users that those websites are operated or authorized by Complainant which they are obviously not.

The Panel, therefore, finds the second element of the Policy has been established, too.

#### **D. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

Third, 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 circumstances to this case leave no doubts that Respondents were fully aware of Complainant's rights in its LLOYD trademark when registering the disputed domain names and that the latter are clearly directed there. Moreover, using the disputed domain names to operate an online shop where purported Complainant's goods were sold, thereby prominently displaying Complainant's LLOYD trademark and imitating the look and feel of Complainant's official website, without any authorization to do so, is a clear indication that Respondents intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to their own websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's LLOYD trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of Respondents' websites. Such circumstances are evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain names in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. In this context, UDRP panels have also long held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, the alleged sale of counterfeit products) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

Finally, it also carries weight in the eyes of the Panel that Respondents obviously provided false or incomplete contact information in the Whois register for the disputed domain names since, according to the email correspondence between the Center and the courier service, the Written Notice on the Notification of Complaint dated May 5, 2025 could not be delivered due to invalid address information. This fact at least throws a light on Respondents' behavior which supports the Panel's bad faith finding.

The Panel, therefore, finds that Complainant has established the third element of the Policy, too.

#### **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, <lloyd-australia.com>, <lloyd-deutschland.com>, <lloyd-polska.com>, <lloyd-turkiye.com>, and <lloydzapatatos.com>, be transferred to Complainant.

*/Stephanie G. Hartung/*

**Stephanie G. Hartung**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 20, 2025