

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lookers Limited v. Sy Mark
Case No. D2025-4218

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Lookers Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Com Laude Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Sy Mark, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lookersplc.com> (the "Disputed Domain Name") is registered with DropCatch.com LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 14, 2025. On October 15, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On November 15, 2025, 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 (Redacted for Privacy, NameBrightPrivacy.com) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 16, 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 October 17, 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 October 20, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 9, 2025. The Respondent sent an email communication to the Center on October 22, 2025. On the same day, the Center informed the Parties of the possibility to suspend the proceedings to implement a settlement agreement, referring to the Respondent's email. On October 29,

2025, the Complainant stated it did not wish to suspend the proceedings. Accordingly, the Center commenced the panel appointment process on November 10, 2025.

The Center appointed Flip Jan Claude Petillion as the sole panelist in this matter on November 12, 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 car dealership chain based in the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland. The Complainant was founded in 1908 in Manchester, United Kingdom. Over the years, the Complainant underwent several organizational changes including a formal change of name to “Lookers plc” in 1973 when it was listed on the London Stock Exchange. The Complainant is no longer a publicly traded company and as such its name is “Lookers Limited”.

The Complainant invokes the following registered trademarks:

- LOOKERS, United Kingdom trademark No. UK00002136805 registered on February 27, 1998, covering goods in class 12;
- LOOKERS PLC, United Kingdom trademark No. UK00003001244 registered on October 25, 2013, covering services in classes 35 to 37 and 39.

The Complainant appears to have owned the Disputed Domain Name at least in 2011. The Whois records mention May 27, 2025, as the creation date of the Disputed Domain Name. The Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website mentioning the Complainant's trademarks and appears to offer goods and services similar to those of the Complainant. The website to which the Disputed Domain Name resolves further contains a blog with several articles containing links to car-related websites.

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 the Disputed Domain Name is identical to a trademark in which it has rights.

The Complainant further claims that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name as, in summary:

- the Complainant has found no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known as “Lookers plc” prior to or after the registration of the Disputed Domain Name;
- the Complainant has found no evidence that the Respondent owns any trademarks incorporating the term “lookers plc”. Equally, the Complainant has found no evidence that the Respondent has ever traded legitimately under the business name “Lookers plc”;
- the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant and has not received any permission or consent from the Complainant to use its mark in the Disputed Domain Name or in any other manner;

- the Respondent is using the recognition and attractive force of the Complainant's brand and marks to divert Internet users to competitors of the Complainant, as well as to unrelated and potentially disturbing third-party websites;
- the Respondent is not using the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor makes a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of it; and
- the Disputed Domain Name falsely implies affiliation between the Respondent and the Complainant and therefore the Respondent cannot have a legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name.

Finally, the Complainant claims that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. In summary, according to the Complainant:

- it is inconceivable that the Respondent did not have the Complainant firmly in mind when it registered the Disputed Domain Name;
- the Disputed Domain Name is confusing in and of itself as it is identical to one of the Complainant's trademarks;
- the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's LOOKERS PLC mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website; and
- the use to which the website associated with the Disputed Domain Name has been put will disrupt the Complainant's business.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not formally reply to the Complainant's contentions. In an email of October 22, 2025, the Respondent stated the following:

"I would like to settle this dispute and give the domain back. I purchased lookersplc.com in an auction at DropCatch May 30, 2025. I work in SEO and provide services for clients and use sites like this. I purchased the domain for \$900, I can provide the receipt and with hosting and building it I'm in for about \$1,000. Can we settle for \$1,000?"

6. Discussion and Findings

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 trademarks 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 Panel finds 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 LOOKERS and LOOKERS PLC marks is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. In such cases, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to the incorporated mark for purposes of UDRP standing. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Additionally, the Panel finds that the addition of other terms – here, "plc" – does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the LOOKERS mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

It is well established that the generic Top-Level-Domain (“gTLD”), here “.com”, may be disregarded when considering whether the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is identical to the Complainant’s LOOKERS PLC mark (as spaces are not technically allowed in domain names) and confusingly similar to the LOOKERS mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7. 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 the 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 that the Respondent has not apparently been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. According to the information provided by the Registrar, the Respondent is “Sy Mark”. The Respondent’s use and registration of the Disputed Domain Name was not authorized by the Complainant.

Fundamentally, a respondent’s use of a domain name will not be considered “fair” if it falsely suggests affiliation with the trademark owner. The correlation between a domain name and the complainant’s mark is often central to this inquiry. Generally speaking, UDRP panels have found that domain names identical to a complainant’s trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation. Even where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term, UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant’s LOOKERS and LOOKERS PLC trademarks in their entirety. As shown by the Complainant, “Lookers plc” also used to be the Complainant’s company name when it was listed on the London Stock Exchange. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Disputed Domain Name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant and cannot constitute fair use.

Beyond looking at the disputed domain name and the nature of any additional terms appended to the mark, UDRP panels also assess whether the overall facts and circumstances of the case, and the absence of a response, support a fair use or not. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 2.5.2 and 2.5.3.

The Disputed Domain Name resolves to a website displaying the Complainant's trademarks and appearing to impersonate the Complainant under its previous name by stating the following on the home page:

"Welcome to Lookers PLC

Lookers PLC is a major automotive retail and distribution company within the UK that represents more than 31 famous franchises in more than 70 outlets in the country. Be it your first car purchase, replacement of your family vehicle or even seeking out fleet solutions, we will assist you in all stages of your process."

The website also includes links to third-party websites, at least one of which is related to pornographic content and others which relate to the Complainant's car business.

The Panel finds that this does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services, or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name. UDRP panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (e.g. 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 Respondent had the opportunity to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests but did not do so. The Respondent simply offered to settle the present dispute upon payment of USD 1,000, which the Complainant refused. In the absence of a formal Response from the Respondent, the prima facie case established by the Complainant has not been rebutted.

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. Among these factors demonstrating bad faith registration and use is the use of a domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or location or of a product or service on the website or location.

In the present case, the Panel finds it inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its trademark rights when it registered the Disputed Domain Name:

- the Disputed Domain Name incorporates both trademarks of the Complainant in their entirety. The Disputed Domain Name is even identical to one of these trademarks, which also corresponds to the Complainant's former company name;
- the Complainant's trademarks predate the registration of the Disputed Domain Name by more than 20 years;
- the Disputed Domain Name refers to a website displaying the Complainant's marks and appearing to impersonate the Complainant under its previous name, while including links to third-party websites including websites related to the Complainant's business.

In the Panel's view, the circumstances of this case indicate that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark. Given that the use of a domain name for per se illegitimate activity can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent, such behavior is manifestly considered evidence of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

By failing to formally respond to the Complaint, the Respondent did not take any initiative to contest the foregoing. Pursuant to paragraph 14 of the Rules, the Panel may draw the conclusions it considers appropriate.

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 <lookersplc.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Flip Jan Claude Petillion/

Flip Jan Claude Petillion

Sole Panelist

Date: November 27, 2025