

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

LPL Financial LLC v. Eryn Nikkole  
Case No. D2025-5400

### **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 Eryn Nikkole, Estonia.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <lpl-financial-corporation.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 24, 2025. On December 26, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 26, 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 29, 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 January 8, 2026.

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 January 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 29, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 30, 2026.

The Center appointed Roger Staub as the sole panelist in this matter on February 9, 2026. 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 provides retail financial advice and is considered the largest independent broker-dealer in United States. It was founded in 1989 through the merger of the two brokerage firms Linsco and Private Ledger. Since 2010, the Complainant has been publicly traded on the NASDAQ under “LPLA”. The Complainant provides an integrated platform of brokerage and investment advisory services to more than 28,000 investment advisors. It has over 9,000 employees. In the third quarter of 2025, the Complainant’s gross profit reached over USD 1.47 billion.

The Complainant owns various trademark registrations consisting of, or containing, the elements “LPL” and “LPL FINANCIAL” in a number of jurisdictions worldwide. The Complainant’s portfolio of LPL and LPL FINANCIAL trademark registrations includes, inter alia, the following trademark registrations:

- United States service mark No. 1801076 for LPL, registered on October 26, 1993 (first use: 1992), in Class 36;
- European Union Trade Mark No. 18653024 for LPL FINANCIAL, registered on November 11, 2022, in Class 36; and
- Chinese Trademark Registration No. 38031585 for LPL FINANCIAL, registered on February 21, 2020, in Class 36.

Further, the Complainant owns registrations for the domain names <lpl.com>, <lpl.net>, and <lpl-financial.com>, among other “lpl” formative domain names.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 12, 2025.

The disputed domain name resolved to a website with a logo featuring “LPL Finance”. The website purported to offer financial trading services via the “LPL Web Trader” platform. In the footer of the website, it was stated that “the company operates under the name: LPL Finance”, thereby displaying the Complainant’s corporate office address. The website further featured a link to BrokerCheck by FINRA, which leads to the official BrokerCheck listing for the Complainant.

#### **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 submits the following:

First, the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant’s trademarks. The Complainant owns trademark registrations for LPL and LPL FINANCIAL. The disputed domain name comprises these trademarks in their entirety, followed by the term “corporation”. The inclusion of the trademarks in the disputed domain name is sufficient to establish confusing similarity between the marks and the disputed domain name. The addition of hyphens and the term “corporation” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

Second, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not received any license or other authorization of any kind to make use of the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain name or otherwise. The Respondent's website features false contact details, which was intended to lend a veneer of authenticity. Further, there is no apparent connection between the registrant information for the disputed domain name and the details listed on the Respondent's website. The Respondent's website features false statements, which are made with the intention to mislead Internet users and exploit the Complainant's reputation. There is a risk that unsuspecting Internet users will be misled into making investment payments to the Respondent, who appears to be engaged in an advance-fee phishing scheme. In addition, there is no evidence suggesting that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, which had been registered in the name of a proxy service.

Third, the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant's trademarks are inherently distinctive and have been continuously and extensively used for over 30 years. As a result, they have acquired considerable reputation and goodwill worldwide. The Respondent could not credibly argue that it did not have knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark rights when registering the disputed domain name. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name in order to create a misleading impression of association with the Complainant, with a view to engaging in activity designed to mislead Internet users. This is further supported by the use of a proxy service. The fact that there is no disclaimer on the Respondent's website to clarify the Respondent's lack of relationship with the Complainant further adds to the confusion caused by the disputed domain name.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

According to the Policy, to qualify for a cancellation or transfer, the Complainant must prove each of the following:

First, the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark to which the Complainant has rights.

Second, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

Third, the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Since the Respondent did not submit a reply, the Panel may choose to accept the reasonable contentions of the Complainant as true. This Panel will determine whether those facts constitute a violation of the Policy that is sufficient to order the transfer of the disputed domain name (see *Joseph Phelps Vineyards LLC v. NOLDC, Inc., Alternative Identity, Inc., and Kentech*, WIPO Case No. [D2006-0292](#)).

### **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 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.

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 that the disputed domain name resolved to a website stating that “the company operates under the name: LPL Finance”, thereby displaying the Complainant’s corporate office address. The Complainant submits that it has not authorized this use of its LPL trademark. Visitors of the website, to which the disputed domain name resolves, are likely to believe that the website is run by the Complainant or with its authorization. Panels have held that a respondent’s use of a domain name will not be considered “fair” if it falsely suggests affiliation with the trademark owner, which is the case here. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5. Further, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed: impersonation) 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.

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 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 held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here: impersonation and potential phishing) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy. The Panel notes that the Complainant submits as evidence screenshots of the website accessible under the disputed domain name, showing an apparently malicious website. The website purported the offering of services via an “LPL Web Trader” platform. It pretends that the company operating the website is active under the name “LPL Finance”, which corresponds to the Complainant’s company name with the mere

change of “Financial” with “Finance”. Internet users are further misled by the fact that the website contains the Complainant’s corporate office address and features a link leading to the Complainant’s official BrokerCheck listing. The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant’s trademark, which is distinctive and has a certain reputation. This distinctive and reputed trademark has been combined with a purely descriptive term (“corporation”). In addition, it appears that the Respondent has sought to conceal its identity by using a privacy service. All this together creates a likelihood of confusion and suggests that the Respondent, by registering and using the disputed domain name, is aiming at misleading Internet users. The Respondent failed to submit a response and, thus, any evidence of an actual or contemplated good faith use.

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 <lpl-financial-corporation.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Roger Staub/*

**Roger Staub**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 17, 2026