

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LPL Financial LLC v. Anna li

Case No. D2025-2174

1. The Parties

The Complainant is LPL Financial LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Hogan Lovells (Paris) LLP, France.

The Respondent is Anna li, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lplfinancialfreedom.net> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 3, 2025. On June 4, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On the same day, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 7, 2025, 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 June 12, 2025.


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 June 13, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 3, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties of the Respondent's default on July 9, 2025.

The Center appointed Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa as the sole panelist in this matter on July 29, 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

The Complainant is a United States company that provides brokerage and financial advisory services to financial advisors, financial institutions, and private individuals. It is the proprietor of numerous registrations in various jurisdictions, including the following:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 1801076 for LPL (word mark), registered on October 26, 1993, for services in class 36; and
- United States Trademark Registration No. 3662425 for  **LPL Financial** (device mark), registered on August 4, 2009 for services in classes 36 and 42.

The Complainant claims that it operates its main corporate website at the domain name <lpl.com>, registered in 1994. The Complainant has also registered the domain names <lpl.net>, <lplfinancial.com>, <lpl-financial.com>, <lplaccountview.com>, among others. The Complainant's parent company, LPL Holdings, Inc., is the owner of the new generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") ".lpl" and ".lplfinancial".

The disputed domain name was registered on March 28, 2025. It resolves to a website featuring the headline "YOUR BUSINESS" with text in Chinese characters below, meaning "coming soon". Beneath text stating "Contact Us," the website allows Internet users to enter an email address and a message. The Complaint also notes that email exchange ("MX") records have been configured for the disputed domain name.

The record indicates that on May 20, 2025 the Complainant's representatives sent a notice to the Respondent via the Registrar's registrant contact form. The record does not reflect a response thereto.

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 name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that it was formed in 1989 and today its 9,100 employees provide brokerage and investment advisory services to more than 22,000 investment advisors managing over USD 1.4 trillion in advisory and brokerage assets. The Complainant has made significant investments in its LPL and LPL FINANCIAL marks, which are reflected in the disputed domain name. The addition of the term "freedom" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Respondent has no connection to the Complainant and has not been authorized to use its marks. The disputed domain name resolves to a parking page with Chinese text stating "Coming Soon" inviting Internet users to submit a form. The Complainant's marks are inherently distinctive and well known. Due to the configuration of MX records, there is an appreciable risk that the disputed domain name is being used or could be used in connection with a fraudulent email scheme targeting the Complainant's advisors and/or clients, or for other fraudulent purposes.

The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the UDRP requires the Complainant to make out all three of the following:

- (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 Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Under paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, “[a] Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable”.

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 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 Complainant’s LPL FINANCIAL mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed 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, “freedom”) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such a term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed 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 disputed 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 disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Panel notes the composition of the disputed domain name, comprising the Complainant's LPL and LPL FINANCIAL marks together with the term "freedom". The Panel notes that the Respondent has not provided any explanation for its choice of the disputed domain name. The Panel finds, on the balance of probabilities, that the nature of the disputed domain name, coupled with its use, signals the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website at the dispute domain name.

The Respondent has not put forward any rights or legitimate interests. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, or that there are any circumstances or activities that would establish the Respondent's rights therein. Rather, the disputed domain name directed to a parking website inviting Internet users to enter their email address to contact the website holder and to sign up for email updates. Under these circumstances, such use cannot establish rights or legitimate interests. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.2.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Complainant's rights in its LPL and LPL FINANCIAL marks predate the registration of the disputed domain name by more than 30 and 15 years, respectively. The disputed domain name reflects the Complainant's well-established LPL FINANCIAL trademark followed by the term "freedom".

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or "coming soon" page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Moreover, the record reflects that the Respondent has configured MX records for the disputed domain name. In light of the finding that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, the Panel considers that configuration of MX records indicates a risk that the Respondent may use the disputed domain name in bad faith to unduly profit from the value of the Complainant's LPL and LPL FINANCIAL marks incorporated therein.

The Panel finds that the 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 <lplfinancialfreedom.net> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa/

Ingrīda Kariņa-Bērziņa

Sole Panelist

Date: August 7, 2025