

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LPL Financial LLC v. Hota Coinbase Ltd Hota Coinbase Ltd, Hota Coinbase Ltd, Anna li, pi xiu, CXM TRADING
Case No. D2025-2223

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are Hota Coinbase Ltd Hota Coinbase Ltd, Hota Coinbase Ltd, United States; Hota Coinbase Ltd, Hota Coinbase Ltd, United States; Anna li, United States; and pi xiu, CXM TRADING, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <lplfinanciallca.com>, <lplfinanciallcc.com>, <lplfinancialllc.org>, <lplfinancialllcc.com>, <lplfinancialllcc.com>, <lplfinancialllcvip.com>, <lplfinancialllcvip.com> are registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd.

The disputed domain name <lplfinancialllcau.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC.

The disputed domain name <lplfinancialllc.net> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC. (jointly referred to as the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 6, 2025. On June 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by emails to the Registrar requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 10 and 11, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by emails to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which partially differed from the named Respondents (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC, Hota Coinbase Ltd, Redacted for privacy, Domain Administrator, See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 12, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the 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. The Complainant filed the first amended Complaint on June 19, 2025.

On June 25, 2025, the Complainant filed the second amended Complaint adding two disputed domain names <lplfinancialcua.cc> and <lplfinanciallcvip.cc>. On June 27, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the added two disputed domain names. On June 30, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which partially differed from the named Respondents (Redacted for Privacy, Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC, Anna Li, Hota Coinbase Ltd, Domain Administrator, See PrivacyGuardian.org, Pi Xiu, CXM TRADING) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 30, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the 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. The Complainant filed the third amended Complaint on July 2, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 4, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 24, 2025. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on July 28, 2025.

The Center appointed Gary Saposnik as the sole panelist in this matter on August 5, 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, LPL Financial LLC, founded in 1989, is in the retail financial advice market, and by its account, is the largest independent broker-dealer in the United States. The Complainant serves independent financial advisors and financial institutions, providing them with the technology, research, clearing and compliance services, and practice management programs to guide clients seeking wealth management, retirement planning, financial planning, and asset management solutions.

Since 2010, the Complainant has been publicly traded on the NASDAQ exchange. The Complainant provides an integrated platform of brokerage and investment advisory services to more than 28,000 investment advisors including advisors at approximately 1,200 institution-based investment programs and at approximately 570 registered investment advisor firms, nationwide managing over USD 1.7 trillion in advisory and brokerage assets. The Complainant has over 7,700 employees, with its primary offices in the United States.

The Complainant has an online presence on a number of platforms, including owning many domain names consisting of or containing "LPL", including <lpl.com>, registered in 1994, from which it operates its main corporate website, as well as <lpl.net>, <lpl-financial.com>, <lplfinancial.com>, and many others. The Complainant's Facebook page has some 22,000 followers, along with over 24,000 followers on X.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for LPL and LPL FINANCIAL, including the following:

- LPL, United States Reg. No. 1801076, registered October 26, 1993, in Class 36, for financial management services;
- LPL, European Union Reg. No. 018653022, registered May 26, 2022, in Class 36, including for financial, monetary and banking services;
- LPL FINANCIAL (figurative), United States Reg. No. 3662425, registered August 4, 2009, in Classes, 36 and 42, including for financial advice and financial management services;
- LPL FINANCIAL (figurative), European Union Reg. No. 018653024, registered November 11, 2022, in Class 36, including for financial, monetary and banking services;
- LPL FINANCIAL, United Kingdom Reg. No. UK00003753611, registered May 13, 2022, in Classes 36 and 42, including for financial advice and financial management services.

The disputed domain names were registered on the following dates:

- <lplfinancialllcus.com>, registered March 27, 2025, at Gname.com Pte. Ltd
- <lplfinancialllcus.cc>, registered March 27, 2025, at Gname.com Pte. Ltd
- <lplfinancialllcau.com>, registered March 30, 2025, at NameSilo, LLC
- <lplfinancialllc.net>, registered March 30, 2025, at GoDaddy.com, LLC
- <lplfinancialllc.org>, registered April 8, 2025, at Gname.com Pte. Ltd
- <lplfinancialllcvip.com>, registered April 10, 2025, at Gname.com Pte. Ltd
- <lplfinancialllcus.cc>, registered May 19, 2025, at Gname.com Pte. Ltd
- <lplfinancialllcua.cc>, registered June 3, 2025, at Gname.com Pte. Ltd
- <lplfinancialllcvip.cc>, registered June 4, 2025, at Gname.com Pte. Ltd

The disputed domain name <lplfinancialllcua.cc> resolves to a website that impersonates the Complainant, featuring the Complainant's "LPL Financial" logo and trademark, and includes multiple references to "LPL FINANCIAL LLC", including in the website footer. The Respondent's website features an email address connected to the disputed domain name.

Until on or around May 2025, the disputed domain names <lplfinancialllcus.com> and <lplfinancialllcus.cc> resolved to websites that were similar, if not identical, to the website at <lplfinancialllcua.cc>, impersonating the Complainant. Besides the similar references to the Complainant's trademarks and logos, along with the email address of "...@lplfinancialllcus.com", the sites prompted Internet users to "open a real account", "upload proof of identity" and "deposit and withdraw funds online" to have access to the trading options. Following requests to the Registrar by the Complainant, the disputed domain names <lplfinancialllcus.com> and <lplfinancialllcus.cc> have been suspended and currently resolve to inactive web pages.

The disputed domain names <lplfinancialllc.org>, <lplfinancialllcvip.com>, <lplfinancialllcvip.cc>, <lplfinancialllcus.cc>, and <lplfinancialllcus.cc> resolve to inactive web pages. The disputed domain name <lplfinancialllc.net> resolves to a Registrar-provided parking page, and the disputed domain name <lplfinancialllcau.com> resolves to a parking page with pay-per-click ("PPC") links.

In May and June 2025, the Complainant's representatives sent notices to the Respondents in relation to the disputed domain names <lplfinancialllcus.cc>, <lplfinancialllc.net>, <lplfinancialllc.org>, <lplfinancialllcau.com>, <lplfinancialllcus.cc>, <lplfinancialllcus.com> and <lplfinancialllcvip.com> via the registrant contact forms. The Complainant's representatives received no response from the Respondents.

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 the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks. The disputed domain names comprise the Complainant's trademarks LPL and LPL FINANCIAL, together with additional letters, as follows:

DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME	ADDITIONAL LETTERS
- <lplfinancialllcus.cc>	"lc", "us"
- <lplfinancialllcua.cc>	"lc", "ua"
- <lplfinancialllc.net>	"llc"
- <lplfinancialllc.org>	"llc"
- <lplfinancialllcau.com>	"llc", "au"
- <lplfinancialllcus.cc>	"llc", "us"
- <lplfinancialllcus.com>	"llc", "us"
- <lplfinancialllcvip.cc>	"llc", "vip"
- <lplfinancialllcvip.com>	"llc", "vip"

The addition of the Additional Letters above to the Complainant's trademarks in the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. See *LPL Financial LLC v. (Zhichao Yang)*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-3670](#); and *LPL Financial LLC v. Withheld for Privacy Purposes, Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy chf/DNS Admin, Intango LTD*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-4172](#).

The Complainant avers that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Respondents are not using the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondents have not received any license or other authorization of any kind to make use of the Complainant's trademarks in a domain name or otherwise.

The Respondents cannot assert that prior to any notice of this dispute it was using, or had made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services in accordance with paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. The use of registrar-provided parking pages is analogous to non-use of a domain name in connection with an active website. See *Meta Platforms, Inc., Meta Platforms Technologies, LLC v. Sachihisa SAISHIKI*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-4699](#).

The disputed domain names <lplfinancialllcua.cc>, <lplfinancialllcus.com> and <lplfinancialllcus.cc> resolve(d) to similar websites that impersonate(d) the Complainant and prompted Internet users to create an account, deposit funds to access trading options, likely as part of a fraudulent trading scheme. Such use of a domain name for illegal activity (e.g., phishing, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 2.13; *LPL Financial LLC v. Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf/Steffen Hain*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-0542](#). The Respondent's attempt to hold itself out as a genuine financial services provider carries a high risk that unsuspecting Internet users will be misled into making payments to the Respondent for services that the Respondent has no intention of providing.

Regarding the current non-use of each of the disputed domain names (except <lplfinancialllcua.cc>) in connection with active websites, or those domain names that are merely parked, the Complainant submits that there is no evidence of the Respondents having made demonstrable preparations to use these disputed domain names. Therefore, the Respondents' use of the disputed domain names does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.2.

There is no evidence to suggest that the Respondents are commonly known by the disputed domain names, and none of the listed names in the Whois bears any resemblance to the disputed domain names. Other than the email address of "...@lplfinancialllcus.com", there is no contact information on the resolving websites. Additionally, there is no evidence of the Respondents having acquired or applied for any trademark registrations for LPL, LPL FINANCIAL, LPL FINANCIAL LLC or any variation thereof, as reflected in the disputed domain names.

Nor are the Respondents making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert customers. In light of the composition of the disputed domain names, including the Complainant's trademarks together with the additional letters noted above, there is a risk that Internet users seeking the Complainant online would be misled as to the source of the disputed domain names with an implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Lastly, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Complainant's LPL and LPL FINANCIAL trademarks have been found to be well-known or having a widespread reputation in the retail financial advice market by prior UDRP Panels. See *LPL Financial LLC v. (Qianmengdan)*, WIPO Case No. [D2021-0150](#); *LPL Financial LLC v. Alfred Andolini*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-5124](#). The Respondents could not credibly argue that they did not have knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark rights when registering the disputed domain names over 30 years after the Complainant's first registration of its LPL trademark.

The Respondents' intent to target the Complainant is apparent from the composition of the disputed domain names themselves, each of which contains the Complainant's trademarks followed by the additional letters "llc" or "lc" which, when combined with the LPL FINANCIAL trademark, are likely intended to refer to the company name of the Complainant, LPL Financial LLC, as well as the additional letters "us", "ua", "vip" and "au". The Respondents registered the disputed domain names to create a misleading impression of association with the Complainant, with a view to deriving revenue from Internet users that are misled into participating in fraudulent advance-fee schemes in bad faith.

The disputed domain names <lplfinancialllc.net> and <lplfinancialllcau.com> were registered using a proxy services and the Complainant did not receive any response to its Registrar registrant contact form notices, further evidencing the Respondents' bad faith. See *Instagram, LLC v. Niyaz Khan, Ergonomic solutions*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-3290](#). The Respondents' registration of nine disputed domain names is further evidence of bad faith registrations. The Respondents' use of false or incomplete registration details is additional evidence of registration in bad faith.

The Complainant alleges that the disputed domain names were used in bad faith. The names <lplfinancialllcua.cc>, <lplfinancialllcus.com> and <lplfinancialllcus.cc> resolve(d) to websites that impersonate the Complainant, likely as part of a fraudulent trading scheme, and include the email address of "...@lplfinancialllcus.com". The use of a domain name for per se illegitimate activity such as phishing can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent and is manifestly considered evidence of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

At the time of the filing, the disputed domain names <lplfinancialllc.org>, <lplfinancialllcvip.com>, <lplfinancialllcus.com>, <lplfinancialllcus.cc>, <lplfinancialllcus.cc>, and <lplfinancialllcvip.cc> resolve to inactive web pages. The disputed domain name <lplfinancialllc.net> resolves to a Registrar-provided parking page, and the disputed domain name <lplfinancialllcau.com> resolves to a parking page with PPC links. The non-use of these disputed domain names in connection with active websites does not prevent a finding of bad faith use under the doctrine of passive holding. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3; *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#).

In regard to the *Telstra* factors, the Complainant notes that the LPL and LPL FINANCIAL trademarks have longstanding and widespread use and have become closely associated with the Complainant. The Respondents failed to respond to the registrant contact form notices submitted by the Complainant. The disputed domain names carry a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant's trademark, with the addition of letters "llc" or "lc", as well as additional letters "vip", "au" or "us". There is no plausible good faith

use to which the disputed domain names could be put that would not have the effect of misleading consumers as to the source or affiliation of the disputed domain names.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different disputed domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names <lplfinancialllcus.cc>, <lplfinancialllc.org>, <lplfinancialllcus.com>, <lplfinancialllcvip.com>, <lplfinancialllcua.cc> and <lplfinancialllcvip.cc> were registered in the name of "Hota Coinbase Ltd, Hota Coinbase Ltd" with the same registrant email address and contact details. The disputed domain name <lplfinancialllcus.cc> was registered in the name of "Hota Coinbase Ltd Hota Coinbase Ltd, Hota Coinbase Ltd", with the same email address as the previous six disputed domain names registered to "Hota Coinbase Ltd, Hota Coinbase Ltd". While the street addresses and phone numbers differ with the <lplfinancialllcus.cc> disputed domain name, the contact addresses and/or phone numbers for all seven disputed domain names are obviously false or incomplete. All seven were registered between March 27, 2025, and June 4, 2025, through the registrar Gname.com Pte. Ltd. The Panel finds that there is prima facie evidence that these seven disputed domain names are under common control.

Of greater difficulty is whether there is common control and whether consolidation would be fair and equitable in relation to the disputed domain names <lplfinancialllcau.com> (registered on March 30, 2025, at NameSilo, LLC) and <lplfinancialllc.net> (registered on March 30, 2025, at GoDaddy.com, LLC). Both of these disputed domain names are registered to different named registrants, but with apparently false addresses and/or phone numbers. The email addresses for the underlying registrant details follow the same pattern, being comprised of various random letters followed by a string of numbers and the email domain "...@gmail.com". These two disputed domain names, while registered under different names and at different registrars, were registered on the same date, and three days after the initial Gname registrations. The Complainant sent notices to both of the named registrants at the contact emails provided through GoDaddy and NameSilo, with neither of the registrants responding. All nine of the disputed domain names follow a similar naming pattern, comprising the Complainant's LPL and LPL FINANCIAL trademarks together with the letters "llc" or "lc", plus the addition of the letters "au", "ua", "us" or "vip", and under the generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") ".net", ".org", ".com" or the country-code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".cc".

The Complainant submits that to require the Complainant to file separate complaints would cause the Complainant to incur considerable time and expense, running contrary to the aim of the Policy to provide a time and cost-effective means for resolving domain name disputes. Based on the above factors, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain names are registered to the same person, or are under common control, and that for reasons of fairness and efficiency, the Complainant is justified in bringing a

single consolidated Complaint against the registrants (collectively referred to as the Respondent). The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request for consolidation.

Based on the totality of the circumstances presented above, as regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party, especially given that the Respondent have not responded nor incurred the costs of responding, have not responded to the notices through their contact details, have not objected to the consolidation, and have provided false contact information, likely in an attempt to avoid detection.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

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 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. The disputed domain names all incorporate the Complainant's LPL and LPL FINANCIAL trademarks in their entirety. The additions of the letters "lc", "llc", "us", "ua", "au" and/or "vip", along with the different Top-Level Domains ("TLDs") of ".cc", ".net", ".org", and ".com", would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7, 1.8, 1.9 and 1.11.

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 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 domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Respondent has not responded to any of the allegations made by the Complainant in the Complaint. The Respondent has not shown use of the disputed domain names (or demonstrable plans for such use) with a bona fide offering for those disputed domain names that were not resolving at the time of filing, namely <lplfinancialllcus.cc>, <lplfinancialllc.org>, <lplfinancialllcus.cc>, <lplfinancialllcvip.cc>, nor for <lplfinancialllc.net> resolving to a GoDaddy parked page. The Respondent has not been commonly known by the disputed domain names, nor have they shown any legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Panels have held that “parked” pages comprising PPC links, as in <lplfinancialllcau.com>, do not represent a bona fide offering of where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant’s mark or otherwise mislead Internet users. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9.

The Complainant has provided evidence of the disputed domain names <lplfinanciallcau.cc>, <lplfinancialllcus.com>, and <lplfinancialllcvip.com> being used to host websites impersonating the Complainant and attempting to mislead Internet users into thinking that the services purported offered for sale on the websites originated from the Complainant. These disputed domain names also falsely suggested that the websites were official sites of the Complainant, while extensively reproducing, without authorization by the Complainant, the Complainant’s trademarks without any disclaimer or association (or lack thereof) with the Complainant. The Panel finds that these circumstances do not confer the Respondent with any rights or legitimate interests in these three respective disputed domain names. See *LPL Financial LLC v. LPL LPL NGUYEN THANK HUNG, plpfinancialltd lplfinancialltd NGUYEN THANH HUNG, lplsvip lplsvip, lplsvip, lpl lpl*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-1943](#); and [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.2.

Panels have also held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here claimed as applicable to this case for these three disputed domain names: phishing, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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 Complainant’s LPL and LPL FINANCIAL trademarks are inherently distinctive and well known in connection with the Complainant’s financial advisory services. See *LPL Financial LLC v. Clark Smith*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0271](#). The Complainant’s LPL trademarks have been continuously and extensively used for more than 30 years, long before the registrations of the disputed domain names. The Complainant’s LPL FINANCIAL marks were also registered a number of years before the disputed domain names.

With the addition of “lc” or “llc” in the disputed domain names, along with the additional country-code or descriptive terms (and combined with bad faith use described below), it is clear that the Respondent’s intent was to deliberately target the Complainant in bad faith when it registered the disputed domain names. The inclusion of the Complainant’s trademarks and copyrighted images on the websites with content are other clear indicia of the targeting of the Complainant’s trademarks comprising bad faith registration.

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 as discussed above may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have also 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 distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain names, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names <lplfinancialllcus.cc>, <lplfinancialllc.net>, <lplfinancialllc.org>, <lplfinancialllcus.cc>, and <lplfinancialllcvip.cc> does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy. See also *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0003](#).

The disputed domain name <lplfinancialllcau.com> contains PPC links that appear to have been “automatically” generated. However, panels have held that a respondent cannot disclaim responsibility for content appearing on the website associated with its domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.5.

Combined with the provision of false contact details, and failure to respond to the Complainant's allegations prior to and in the Complaint, the Panel finds that this disputed domain name <lplfinancialllcau.com> was registered and used in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed as applicable to this case: phishing, impersonation/passing off, or other types of fraud constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. As discussed above, the Respondent used to the disputed domain names <lplfinancialllcua.cc>, <lplfinancialllcus.com> and <lplfinancialllcvip.com> in an apparent phishing scheme to obtain customers financial and personal data, while the Respondent was impersonating and passing itself off as the Complainant. Combined with the false contact details and failure to respond to the Complaint, and having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 names <lplfinancialllcua.cc>, <lplfinancialllcus.cc>, <lplfinancialllcau.com>, <lplfinancialllc.net>, <lplfinancialllc.org>, <lplfinancialllcus.cc>, <lplfinancialllcus.com>, <lplfinancialllcvip.cc>, and <lplfinancialllcvip.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gary Saposnik/

Gary Saposnik

Sole Panelist

Date: August 19, 2025