

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LPL Financial LLC v. Junjie Lin, Tech Hifi, Hota Coinbase Ltd, Hota Coinbase Ltd

Case No. D2025-5401

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 Junjie Lin, Tech Hifi, United States and Hota Coinbase Ltd, Hota Coinbase Ltd, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <lplfinancialllc.cc>, <lplglobal.cc>, and <lplglobal.com> are registered with NameSilo, LLC.

The disputed domain names <lplfinancialllcltd.com>, <lplfinancialllcxm.cc>, <lplfinancialllcxm.cyou> and <lplfinancialllcxms.cc> are registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd (collectively referred to as the “Registrars”).

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 names. On December 26, 2025, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses confirming that the Respondent (Junjie Lin) is listed as the registrant for the disputed domain names <lplfinancialllc.cc>, <lplglobal.cc>, and <lplglobal.com> and providing the contact details, and disclosing registrant and contact information for the remaining disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 29, 2025, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar(s), requesting the Complainant to either file separate a complaint 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 an amended Complaint on January 9, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on January 14, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 3, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on February 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Ik-Hyun Seo as the sole panelist in this matter on February 10, 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 is an independent broker-dealer founded in 1989. The Complainant provides financial services to approximately 28,000 investment advisors including advisors at approximately 1,200 institution-based investment programs and at approximately 570 registered investment advisor firms, managing USD 1.7 trillion in advisory and brokerage assets. The Complainant has over 9,000 employees, and in the third quarter of 2025, had gross profits of USD 1.47 billion. The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for the LPL mark, including United States Trademark Registration No. 1,801,076, registered on October 26, 1993; United Kingdom Trademark Registration Number UK00003753607 registered on May 13, 2022; and European Union Trademark Registration Number 018653022 registered on May 26, 2022. The Complainant also owns numerous trademark registrations for the LPL FINANCIAL mark, including the United States Trademark Registration No. 3662425 registered on August 4, 2009; Chinese Trademark Registration No. 38031585 registered on February 21, 2020; and United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00003753611 registered on November 11, 2022.

Respondent 1 is Junjie Lin, Tech Hifi with an address which appears to be a nonexistent address.

Respondent 2 is Hota Coinbase Ltd, Hota Coinbase Ltd with an address in Los Angeles, California, United States.

Respondent 1 registered the disputed domain names <lplfinancialllc.cc>, <lplglobal.cc> and <lplglobal.com> on November 3, 2025, December 2, 2025, and December 2, 2025, respectively. Respondent 2 registered the disputed domain names <lplfinancialllcltd.com>, <lplfinancialllcxc.com>, <lplfinancialllcxc.cyou> and <lplfinancialllcxms.cc> on November 3, 2025, October 29, 2025, October 30, 2025, and October 29, 2025, respectively.

The disputed domain name <lplfinancialllcltd.com> resolves to a website displaying the Complainant’s LPL Financial mark and logo, claiming to be the website of a company called LPL FINANCIAL LLC providing investment services. The website also displays the email address [...]@lplglobal.com at the top left hand corner.

The other disputed domain names do not resolve to any website with active content.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for transfer of the disputed domain names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's LPL and LPL FINANCIAL trademarks, as the LPL and LPL FINANCIAL marks are clearly recognizable within the disputed domain names despite the additional terms "global", "llc", "ltd", "xm" and "xms".

The Complainant also contends that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names and confirms that it has not authorized or licensed rights to the Respondents in any respect. The Complainant further contends that the disputed domain name <lplfinancialllcld.com> of Respondent 2 resolves to a website that impersonates the Complainant, featuring the Complainant's LPL FINANCIAL logo and purporting to offer a financial trading platform in the name of "LPL financial llc" that prompts Internet users to "Open an Account" and "login" to deposit funds and start trading. The Complainant contends that such use of the Respondent misleads Internet users into making payments to the Respondent for services that the Respondent has no intention of providing in what is commonly known as an "advance-fee scheme" and that this cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Complainant also contends that such use is fraudulent which does not confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. With respect to the other disputed domain names, the Complainant contends that the Respondents' lack of use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services, especially as the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's well-known marks.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Complainant contends that the Complainant's LPL and LPL FINANCIAL trademarks are inherently distinctive and well-known in connection with the Complainant's financial advisory services, and that the Respondents could not credibly argue that it did not have knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark rights when registering the disputed domain names. The Complainant further contends that in light of the way in which the disputed domain name <lplfinancialllcld.com> was used, Respondent 2 surely registered it to create a misleading impression of association with the Complainant and to derive revenue from Internet users that are misled into participating in a fraudulent advance-fee scheme. The Complainant also contends that as all seven disputed domain names are under common control, there was intent to use the remaining six domain names in for similar illegitimate activity, in bad faith.

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 domain name 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, ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that disputed domain names <lplfinancialllc.cc>, <lplglobal.cc> and <lplglobal.com> are registered to Respondent 1, while disputed domain names <lplfinancialllcld.com>, <lplfinancialllcxm.cc>, <lplfinancialllcxm.cyou> and <lplfinancialllcxms.cc> are registered to Respondent 2. Nonetheless, the Panel is of the opinion that all seven disputed domain names are subject to common control.

For one, the disputed domain names were all registered within a span of a little more than one month. Further, one of the disputed domain names registered to Respondent 1 consists of “lplfinancialllc”, and the disputed domain names registered to Respondent 2 all contain “lplfinancialllc” plus additional terms. In addition, the website linked to <lplfinancialllcld.com> registered to Respondent 2 displays the email address [...]@lplglobal.com, while Respondent 1 is the registrant of domain name <lplglobal.com>.

For the reasons above, the Panel is of the view that all seven of the disputed domain names are controlled by the same Respondent.

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

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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the marks LPL and/or LPL FINANCIAL are recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms - here, “llc”, “global”, “ltd”, “llcxm”, and “llcxms” – may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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 3.1](#), 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity – here, claimed impersonation/passing off with respect to disputed domain name <lplfinancialllcld.com> – can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Moreover, the disputed domain names are all composed of the LPL or LPL FINANCIAL mark, along with additional terms “llc”, “global” (misspelling of “global”), “ltd”, “xm” (name of a global broker), or “xms” which are closely connected with and suggest sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant which is a corporation providing financial services. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

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.

First, the Panel notes that the Respondent registered seven disputed domain names incorporating the Complainant's LPL and/or LPL FINANCIAL marks along with other terms closely associated with the Complainant in different combinations. This would be unlikely without prior knowledge of the Complainant's business and its marks. In addition, based on the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name <lplfinancialllcld.com> to display a copycat website purported to be operated by the Complainant, it is clear that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and its marks and targeted them when registering the disputed domain name, and by extension, the other six disputed domain names at issue in the subject case, as well.

In fact, it is likely that the Respondent created a fake website using the disputed domain name <lplfinancialllcld.com> confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks in order to confuse and mislead visitors as to its association with the Complainant in order to engage in fraudulent activity. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity – here, claimed impersonation/passing off – constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name <lplfinancialllcld.com> constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

With respect to the six other domain names at issue in the subject case, there does not seem to have been any use by the Respondent. But 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 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the composition of the disputed domain names, the use of a privacy shield to hide the identity of the Respondent, the Respondent's use of false contact details, the failure of the Respondent to submit a response to the Complainant. Taking the above factors into consideration the Panel finds it implausible that the disputed domain names may be put into any good faith use, 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.

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 <lpifinanciallc.cc>, <lpifinanciallcltd.com>, <lpifinanciallccxm.cc>, <lpifinanciallccxm.cyou>, <lpifinanciallccxms.cc>, <lpiglobal.cc>, <lpiglobal.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ik-Hyun Seo/

Ik-Hyun Seo

Sole Panelist

Date: February 24, 2026