

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LPL Financial LLC v. Hota Coinbase Ltd, ANjjltd James Bro
Case No. D2025-3773

1. The Parties

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

Respondent is Hota Coinbase Ltd and ANjjltd James Bro, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <lplfinancialllcef.com>, <lplfinancialllcefra.cc>, <lplfinancialllcefre.cc>, <lplfinancialllcefreoos.cc>, and <lplfinancialllcotp.cc> are registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd.

The disputed domain name <lplfinancialllcmailotp.cc> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrars”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 17, 2025. On September 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar Gname.com Pte. Ltd a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names <lplfinancialllcef.com>, <lplfinancialllcefra.cc>, <lplfinancialllcefre.cc>, and <lplfinancialllcefreoos.cc>. On September 18, 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 (Redacted for privacy Redacted for privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on September 23, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on September 29, 2025, adding <lplfinancialllcmailotp.cc> and <lplfinancialllcotp.cc> to the Complaint. On October 2 and 6, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars a request for registrar verification in connection with these additional disputed domain names. On October 3 and 6, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on October 6, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, 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. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on October 10, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on October 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 13, 2025. Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondents' default on November 17, 2025.

The Center appointed Lorelei Ritchie as the sole panelist in this matter on November 24, 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

A. Complainant

Complainant is a multinational company based in the United States. For decades prior to the registration of the disputed domain names, Complainant has offered financial and brokerage services under the mark LPL. Complainant is the owner of numerous registrations for the LPL mark in various global jurisdictions. These include, among others, United States Registration No. 1,801,076 (registered on October 26, 1993) and European Union Registration No. 018653024 (registered on November 12, 2022). Complainant also owns the registration for various domain names that incorporate its LPL mark, including some with Complainant's full corporate name, LPL Financial LLC. Among these are "lpl.com" (registered on August 2, 1994), which Complainant uses to engage with users online regarding the products and services offered under its LPL mark.

B. The Disputed Domain Names

The disputed domain names were registered between August 7 and September 18, 2025.

The disputed domain name <lplfinancialllcefre.cc> previously resolved to a website that sought to impersonate Complainant, featuring Complainant's LPL FINANCIAL trademark and logo in its top-left corner, while purporting to operate an online currency trading platform. Complainant has also received a report of fraudulent activity via the disputed domain names <lplfinancialllcefra.cc> and <lplfinancialllcefreoos.cc>. At the time of submission of the Complaint, none of the disputed domain names resolved to an active web page.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks, (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith.

Specifically, Complainant contends that it owns rights the LPL mark, which is "well known internationally", that Complainant is the "largest independent broker-dealer" in the United States, and that Complainant manages over USD 1.7 trillion in advisory and brokerage assets, trading under the moniker "LPLA" on the NASDAQ stock exchange since 2010.

Complainant contends that Respondent has incorporated Complainant's LPL mark into the disputed domain names as part of Complainant's full corporate name, LPL Financial LLC, and merely added various other terms, with the Top-Level-Domain such as ".cc" or ".com." Complainant further contends that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names and rather has registered and is using them in bad faith, having simply acquired the disputed domain names for Respondent's own commercial gain, including by using some or all of the disputed domain names to communicate with consumers online in a fraudulent attempt to impersonate Complainant. Finally, Complainant alleges that Respondent has engaged in a pattern of bad faith conduct in registering infringing domain names.

B. Respondents

Respondents did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The disputed domain names were registered between August 7 and September 18, 2025. One of the disputed domain names, <lpifinancialllcmailtp.cc>, was registered with a different registrar, and was reported by that registrar as having a different named registrant than the other five. Complainant nevertheless alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or are otherwise under common control. Complainant thus requests consolidation of the Complaint against the listed registrants of all six disputed domain names pursuant to paragraphs 3(c) and 10(e) and of the Rules.

Pursuant to WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 4.11.2, the Panel considers 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. In this regard, five of the six disputed domain names were registered with the same registrar and have the same registrant. The disputed domain name <lpifinancialllcmailtp.cc>, although with a different registrar and listing a different registrant, follows a highly similar pattern in the selected name, incorporating Complainant's full corporate name and ending with the Top-Level Domain ".cc." One of the disputed domain names has been linked to a website masquerading as an official website of Complainant, and two others have been flagged for fraudulent communications, also masquerading as Complainant. The Panel finds that Complainant has shown prima facie evidence of common control, which the listed registrants named collectively as Respondent have neither addressed nor rebutted. The request to consolidate the Complaint as to the all disputed domain names is granted and the Respondents will collectively be hereinafter referred to as the "Respondent".

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.

Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark, LPL, for the purposes of the Policy, which is incorporated in full in each of the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

Although the addition of other terms may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and Complainant's mark for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The Panel therefore finds that each of the disputed domain names is confusingly similar to a trademark in which Complainant has rights in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. Respondent has not rebutted 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 Panel finds that Complainant has provided sufficient evidence of Respondent's lack of "rights or legitimate interests" in accordance with paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy which Respondent has not rebutted.

D. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

There are several ways that a complainant can demonstrate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith. Although the disputed domain names do not appear to resolve to active websites as of the filing of Complainant, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name <lpfinanciaallcefre.cc> was used to impersonate Complainant to consumers online. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Furthermore, Complainant has submitted evidence that Respondent has engaged in a pattern of bad faith conduct. In addition to the disputed domain names in this proceeding, Respondent was one of the named parties in a prior UDRP proceeding, transferring a number of similarly-worded domain names to Complainant, upon a finding of bad faith. (*LPL Financial LLC v. Anna li, Hota Coinbase Ltd, pi xiu*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2223](#).)

The disputed domain names resolve to inactive websites. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name 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 does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Given the extensive exposure of Complaint's marks, and the inclusion of Complainant's full corporate name in each of the disputed domain names, the Panel finds sufficient evidence that Respondent registered and used the disputed domain names in bad faith for purposes of paragraph (4)(a)(iii) 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 <lplfinancialllcef.com>, <lplfinancialllcefra.cc>, <lplfinancialllcefre.cc>, <lplfinancialllcefreos.cc>, <lplfinancialllcotp.cc>, and <lplfinancialllcmailotp.cc> be transferred to Complainant.

/Lorelei Ritchie/

Lorelei Ritchie

Sole Panelist

Date: December 4, 2025