

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Loop B.V. v. Lizzie Dickinson V, Cynthia Parker, 吴鶴 (Wu Yi), Toby Doyle, Tilly Jennings, Harris Noah, Noah Harris, Hilton Abigail, Abigail Hilton, Knowles Lydia, Lydia Knowles, Fuller Joel, Joel Fuller, Fuller Isabel, Isabel Fuller, Harding Abbie, Abbie Harding, Bevan Kayleigh, Kayleigh Bevan, Name Redacted

Case No. D2025-4238

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Loop B.V., Belgium, represented by Novagraaf Belgium NV/SA, Belgium.

The Respondents are Lizzie Dickinson V, United States of America ("United States"), Cynthia Parker, United States, 吴鶴 (Wu Yi), China, Toby Doyle, Germany, Tilly Jennings, Germany, Harris Noah, Noah Harris, Germany, Hilton Abigail, Abigail Hilton, Germany, Knowles Lydia, Lydia Knowles, Germany, Fuller Joel, Joel Fuller, Germany, Fuller Isabel, Isabel Fuller, Germany, Harding Abbie, Abbie Harding, Germany, Bevan Kayleigh, Kayleigh Bevan, Germany, and Name Redacted.¹

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <loopearplugeshop.com> is registered with Web Commerce Communications Limited dba WebNic.cc.

The disputed domain names <loopearplugsargentina.com>, <loopearplugschile.com>, <loopearplugscolombia.com>, <loopearplugsindia.com>, <loopearplugsindonesia.com>, <loopearplugsgreece.com>, and <loopearplugssingapore.com> are registered with CNOBIN Information Technology Limited.

¹ The name and contact details of one Respondent appear to have been used without her consent when registering the disputed domain name <loopearplugssuomi.com>. Given the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the name of that Respondent from this Decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this Decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of that disputed domain name, which includes the names of all Respondents. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding, and has indicated that Annex 1 to this Decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST 12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

The disputed domain names <loopearplugsaustralia.com>, <loopearplugsbelgium.com>, <loopearplugscanada.com>, <loopearplugsdanmark.com>, <loopearplugsdeutschland.com>, <loopearplugseesti.com>, <loopearplugsespana.com>, <loopearplugsfrance.com>, <loopearplugshungary.com>, <loopearplugsnederland.com>, <loopearplugsnorge.com>, <loopearplugs Polska.com>, <loopearplugsportugal.com>, <loopearplugsromania.com>, <loopearplugsverige.com>, and <loopearplugsuk.com> are registered with Xin Net Technology Corporation.

The disputed domain name <loopearplugshq.com> is registered with Spaceship, Inc.

The disputed domain names <loopearplugsmalaysia.com>, and <loopearplugs southafrica.com> are registered with Name SRS AB.

The disputed domain name <loopearplugssuomi.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc.

Web Commerce Communications Limited dba WebNic.cc, CNOBIN Information Technology Limited, Xin Net Technology Corporation, Spaceship, Inc, Name SRS AB and Dynadot Inc. are individually and collectively referred to below as the "Registrar".

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on October 15, 2025. On the following day, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On October 16, October 17, and October 28, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names that differed from the named Respondent (Anonymous) and contact information in the Complaint. The Complainant filed the first amended Complaint in English on October 21, 2025.

On November 10, 2025, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain names <loopearplugsbelgium.com>, <loopearplugsnederland.com>, <loopearplugscanada.com>, <loopearplugsnorge.com>, <loopearplugsdanmark.com>, <loopearplugsuk.com>, <loopearplugsfrance.com>, <loopearplugsdeutschland.com>, <loopearplugsespana.com>, <loopearplugsverige.com>, <loopearplugs Polska.com>, <loopearplugsportugal.com>, <loopearplugseesti.com>, <loopearplugsromania.com>, and <loopearplugshungary.com> is Chinese. On the same day, the Complainant requested that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondents did not submit any comment on the language of the proceeding.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 10, 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 second amended Complaint in English on the same day.

On November 12, 2025, the Complainant requested the addition of the disputed domain name <loopearplugsaustralia.com>, to the current proceeding. On November 13, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the relevant Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the newly added disputed domain name. On the same day, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center confirming that the named Respondent is listed as the registrant of this disputed domain name and providing the contact details. The Center sent a request for an amendment to the Complainant concerning the addition of this disputed domain name on the same day. The Complainant filed the third amended Complaint in English on the following day.

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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 13, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 3, 2025. The Respondents did not submit any formal response. However, a third party sent an email to the Center on December 13, 2025, claiming unauthorized use of her identity and requesting redaction of her personal contact details from the Decision. The Center commenced the panel appointment process on December 22, 2025.

The Center appointed Matthew Kennedy as the sole panelist in this matter on December 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

The Complainant is a Belgian life sciences technology company that produces high-performance earplugs, among other products. It markets its LOOP brand earplugs in many countries and regions, including the European Union, China, and the United States. It reported net sales of approximately EUR 200 million in 2024. The Complainant is the owner of multiple trademark registrations in multiple jurisdictions, including the following:

- European Union trademark registration number 015088693 for LOOP, registered since May 24, 2016; and
- International trademark registration number 1626467 for LOOP, registered since October 4, 2021, designating multiple jurisdictions, including China and the United States.

The above trademark registrations are current. The Complainant also uses the domain name <loopearplugs.com>, registered on September 9, 2015, in connection with its website where it provides information about itself and its products. That website is titled “Loop Earplugs”. The Complainant has released a limited-edition range of earplugs in a collaboration with the Tomorrowland music festival.

The Respondents are identified as various individuals in China, Germany, and the United States.

The disputed domain names were registered on the dates and in the names shown below:

Date of registration	Disputed domain name	Registrant
December 27, 2024	<loopearplugshq.com>	cynthia parker
April 16, 2025	<loopearplugseshop.com>	Lizzie Dickinson V
August 14, 2025	<loopearplugsaustralia.com>	吴鶯 (wu yi)
August 18, 2025	<loopearplugssuomi.com>	Name redacted
August 19, 2025	<loopearplugsbelgium.com>	吴鶯 (wu yi)
August 20, 2025	<loopearplugsnederland.com>	吴鶯 (wu yi)
August 21, 2025	<loopearplugscanada.com>	吴鶯 (wu yi)
August 22, 2025	<loopearplugsdanmark.com>	吴鶯 (wu yi)
August 22, 2025	<loopearplugsnorge.com>	吴鶯 (wu yi)
August 26, 2025	<loopearplugsfrance.com>	吴鶯 (wu yi)
August 26, 2025	<loopearplugsuk.com>	吴鶯 (wu yi)
August 27, 2025	<loopearplugsdeutschland.com>	吴鶯 (wu yi)
August 28, 2025	<loopearplugsespana.com>	吴鶯 (wu yi)
August 28, 2025	<loopearplugssverige.com>	吴鶯 (wu yi)

August 29, 2025	<loopearplugspolska.com>	吴鶴 (wu yi)
August 30, 2025	<loopearplugsportugal.com>	吴鶴 (wu yi)
September 1, 2025	<loopearplugseesti.com>	吴鶴 (wu yi)
September 5, 2025	<loopearplugshungary.com>	吴鶴 (wu yi)
September 5, 2025	<loopearplugsromania.com>	吴鶴 (wu yi)
September 24, 2025	<loopearplugschile.com>	Harding Abbie, Abbie Harding
September 24, 2025	<loopearplugsindia.com>	Knowles Lydia, Lydia Knowles
September 26, 2025	<loopearplugsindonesia.com>	Hilton Abigail, Abigail Hilton
September 26, 2025	<loopearplugsmalaysia.com>	Toby Doyle
September 26, 2025	<loopearplugssingapore.com>	Harris Noah, Noah Harris
September 26, 2025	<loopearplugssouthafrica.com>	Tilly Jennings
September 28, 2025	<loopearplugsargentina.com>	Bevan Kayleigh, Kayleigh Bevan
September 28, 2025	<loopearplugscolombia.com>	Fuller Isabel, Isabel Fuller
September 28, 2025	<loopearplugsgreece.com>	Fuller Joel, Joel Fuller

According to evidence presented by the Complainant, the disputed domain names <loopearplugshq.com> and <loopearplugeshop.com> formerly resolved to websites offering for sale the Complainant's products at discount prices. The other 26 disputed domain names resolve to websites displaying the words "Loop Earplugs" and offering for sale the Complainant's products at discount prices. Certain websites share identical banner images on their homepages including, in some cases, an image promoting the Tomorrowland x Loop range of earplugs. At the time of this Decision, many disputed domain names have ceased to resolve to any active website (i.e., all except <loopearplugsargentina.com>, <loopearplugsbelgium.com>, <loopearplugsbelgium.com>, <loopearplugscolombia.com>, <loopearplugsespana.com>, and <loopearplugssingapore.com>).

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 confusingly similar to its LOOP trademark.

The Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Respondents do not have any connection or affiliation with the Complainant whatsoever nor have they received any license or consent, express or implied, to use the LOOP trademark in the disputed domain names or in any other manner.

The disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. As a result of their extensive and continuous use, the Complainant's LOOP trademarks have become widely known. The Respondents have used the Complainant's trademark and logos on the websites associated with the disputed domain names. These websites impersonated the Complainant and were used to collect sensitive user information. Most of the websites associated with the disputed domain names contain advertisements for services unrelated to the Complainant.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Issues

A. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. Although 16 disputed domain names are registered in the same name, i.e., “吴懿” (wu yi), the other 12 disputed domain names are registered by nominally different registrants. The Complainant alleges that the 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 of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that 26 disputed domain names were registered in a relatively short period of six weeks in August and September 2025. These disputed domain names follow a naming pattern consisting of “loopearplugs”, a geographic term and the generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) extension “.com”, and all resolve to websites offering for sale the Complainant's products, each with similar formatting and identical images to certain others. This gives the Panel reason to find that these 26 disputed domain names or their associated websites are under common control.

However, the Panel does not find a sufficient basis to conclude that the domain names loopearplugshq.com and loopearplugeshop.com or their associated websites are under common control with the others at issue in this proceeding. These two domain names were registered earlier with different registrars following a somewhat different naming pattern and, while the associated websites offer for sale the Complainant's products, they display different content. At least one of them (loopearplugeshop.com) appears to be part of a series of registrations at issue in a prior UDRP proceeding.²

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes regarding the 26 disputed domain names would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different registrants of the disputed domain names loopearplugsargentina.com, loopearplugsaustralia.com, loopearplugsbelgium.com, loopearplugscanada.com, loopearplugschile.com, loopearplugscolombia.com, loopearplugsdanmark.com, loopearplugsdeutschland.com, loopearplugseesti.com, loopearplugsespana.com, loopearplugsfrance.com, loopearplugsgreece.com, loopearplughungary.com, loopearplugsindia.com, loopearplugsindonesia.com, loopearplugsmalaysia.com, loopearplugsnederland.com, loopearplugsnorge.com, loopearplugs Polska.com, loopearplugsportugal.com, loopearplugsromania.com, loopearplugs singapure.com, loopearplugs southafrica.com, loopearplugs suomi.com, loopearplugs verige.com, and loopearplugsuk.com (referred to below as “the Respondent”) in a single proceeding.

² See *Loop B.V. v. Sebastian Pacocha, Icie Lindgren, and Rosie Feil*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-2183](#).

The Panel declines to consolidate the disputes regarding the domain names <loopearplugshq.com> and <loopearplugeshop.com>. This decision is made without prejudice to the possibility of refiling complaints regarding these two domain names.

B. Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreements for the disputed domain names <loopearplugsaustralia.com>, <loopearplugsbelgium.com>, <loopearplugsnederland.com>, <loopearplugscanada.com>, <loopearplugsnorge.com>, <loopearplugsdanmark.com>, <loopearplugsuk.com>, <loopearplugsfrance.com>, <loopearplugsdeutschland.com>, <loopearplugsespana.com>, <loopearplugsverige.com>, <loopearplugs Polska.com>, <loopearplugsportugal.com>, <loopearplugseesti.com>, <loopearplugsromania.com>, and <loopearplugshungary.com> is Chinese, while the language of the Registration Agreements for the other disputed domain names is English. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint and amended Complaints were filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that the Complainant has no capacity to conduct administrative proceedings in Chinese; the Parties are located in entirely different regions of the world; all the disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's trademark followed by a generic English term, which clearly indicates that the Respondent understands and uses English; the websites associated with the disputed domain names contain English words, expressions, and even complete sentences, further evidencing the Respondent's sufficient command of the English language.

Despite the Center having sent an email communication regarding the language of the proceeding, and written notification of the Complaint, in both Chinese and English, the Respondent did not make any submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding or indicate any interest in otherwise participating in this proceeding. Certain websites associated with these disputed domain names are in English, which indicates that the Respondent is able to communicate in that language. Further, the Panel has found that these disputed domain names or the associated websites are under common control with others for which the Registration Agreements are in English.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of a registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time, and costs. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.5.1.

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2. Substantive Issues

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that a complainant must demonstrate each of the following elements with respect to each disputed domain name:

- (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 disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The burden of proof of each element is borne by the Complainant.

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. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

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

The LOOP mark is wholly incorporated in the disputed domain names as their respective initial elements. The mark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain names despite the addition of the word "earplugs" and a geographical term, variously "Argentina", "Australia", "Belgium", "Canada", "Chile", "Colombia", "Danmark" (meaning "Denmark"), Deutschland (meaning "Germany"), "Eesti" (meaning "Estonia"), "Espana" (meaning "Spain"), "France", "Greece", "Hungary", "India", "Indonesia", "Malaysia", "Nederland", "Norge" (meaning "Norway"), "Polska" (meaning "Poland"), "Portugal", "Romania", "Singapore", "South Africa", "Suomi" (meaning "Finland"), "Sverige" (meaning "Sweden"), and "UK" (an abbreviation of the "United Kingdom"). The Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. The only additional element in each disputed domain name is a gTLD extension (".com") which, as a standard requirement of domain name registration, may be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity for the purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.8 and 1.11.1.

Therefore, 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. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

In the present case, the 26 disputed domain names resolve to websites offering for sale the Complainant's products, displaying the Complainant's LOOP mark in the words "Loop Earplugs" and, in several cases, an image promoting the "Tomorrowland x Loop" range of earplugs, giving the impression that they are operated or endorsed by, or affiliated with, the Complainant. The composition of the disputed domain names, combining the Complainant's LOOP trademark with a term describing the Complainant's products (i.e., "earplugs") and a country name, implies that they will resolve to a Complainant-affiliated store for the corresponding country. However, the Complainant submits that the Respondent does not have any connection or affiliation with the Complainant whatsoever. Twenty disputed domain names are now passively held. These circumstances indicate that the Respondent is not using the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services. Nor is the Respondent making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names. Further, the Respondent is identified in the Registrar's Whois database by the names shown in the table in Section 4 above, none of which resembles the disputed domain names. Nothing on the record indicates that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain names.

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.

Based on the record, 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. The fourth circumstance is as follows:

"(iv) by using the [disputed] domain name, [the respondent has] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent's] 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 respondent's] website or location or of a product or service on [the respondent's] web site or location."

In the present case, the disputed domain names were registered in 2025, after the registration of the Complainant's LOOP trademark, including in the European Union and China, where the Respondent is ostensibly based. The disputed domain names incorporate the LOOP trademark as their respective initial elements and combine it with the descriptive term "earplugs", which indicates an awareness of the nature of the Complainant's products. The disputed domain names resolve to websites that offer for sale the Complainant's products. In view of these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names with the Complainant's LOOP mark in mind.

As regards use, the disputed domain names resolve to websites offering for sale the Complainant's products, displaying the Complainant's LOOP mark in the words "Loop Earplugs", giving the false impression that they are operated or endorsed by, or affiliated with, the Complainant. In view of these circumstances and the findings in Section 6.2B above, the Panel finds that, by using the disputed domain names, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's LOOP trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's websites or of the products on those websites within the terms of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel is aware that the use of 20 disputed domain names has recently changed and that they no longer resolve to any active website. This change in use does not alter the Panel's conclusion and may be a further indication of bad faith.

Therefore, 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:

- (i) the Panel orders that the disputed domain names <loopearplugsargentina.com>, <loopearplugsaustralia.com>, <loopearplugsbelgium.com>, <loopearplugscanada.com>, <loopearplugschile.com>, <loopearplugscolombia.com>, <loopearplugsdanmark.com>, <loopearplugsdeutschland.com>, <loopearplugseesti.com>, <loopearplugsespana.com>, <loopearplugsfrance.com>, <loopearplugsgreece.com>, <loopearplugshungary.com>, <loopearplugsindia.com>, <loopearplugsindonesia.com>, <loopearplugsmalaysia.com>, <loopearplugsnederland.com>, <loopearplugsnorje.com>, <loopearplugs Polska.com>, <loopearplugsportugal.com>, <loopearplugsromania.com>, <loopearplugsingapore.com>,

<loopearplugssouthafrica.com>, <loopearplugssuomi.com>, <loopearplugssverige.com>, and <loopearplugsuk.com> be transferred to the Complainant; and

(ii) the Complaint is denied without prejudice as regards the domain names <loopearplugeshop.com>, and <loopearplugshq.com>.

/Matthew Kennedy/

Matthew Kennedy

Sole Panelist

Date: January 7, 2026