

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LPL Financial LLC v. Ben Lane, Hostflies
Case No. D2026-0330

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Ben Lane, Hostflies, Switzerland.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <lplentreprise.com> and <lplfrades.com> are registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 27, 2026. On January 27, 2026, and January 30, 2026, the Center transmitted by emails to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On January 28, 2026, and February 3, 2026, 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 (Registration Private, Privacy Service Provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 3, 2026, 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 February 10, 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, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 5, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Masato Dogauchi as the sole panelist in this matter on March 18, 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 was found in 1989 through the merger of two brokerage firms – Linsco and Private Ledger, and has since been doing business in the retail financial advice market. 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 32,000 investment advisors relating to over USD 2.3 trillion in advisory and brokerage assets. The Complainant has over 9,000 employees.

The Complainant owns trademarks such as:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 1801076 for LPL, registered on October 26, 1993;
- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00003753607 for LPL, registered on May 13, 2022; and
- European Union Trademark No. 018653022 for LPL, registered on May 26, 2022;

The Complainant owns many domain names consisting of or containing LPL mark, including <lpl.com> registered in 1994, from which it operates its main corporate website, as well as, for instance, <lpl.net>, <lpl-financial.com>, <lplfinancial.com>, <lplaccountview.com>. In addition, the Complainant’s Facebook page has some 22,000 followers and its X page has over 24,000.

The disputed domain name <lpltrades.com>, registered on December 4, 2025, resolves to a website entitled “LPL Financial Trades” that prominently displays the Complainant’s LPL mark, name, and South Carolina office address.

The disputed domain name <lplentreprise.com>, registered on November 30, 2025, currently resolves to an inactive default Parking webpage.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant requests for consolidation of the proceedings regarding the disputed domain names, and The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 15(a), a panel shall decide a case on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, the Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable. Since the Respondent has not made any substantive arguments in this case, the following decision is rendered on the basis of the Complainant’s contentions and other evidence submitted by the Complainant.

In accordance with the Policy, paragraph 4(a), in order to qualify for a remedy, the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) The disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) The disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

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 Select UDRP Questions ("[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 entirety of the Complainant's LPL mark is reproduced 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.

The Panel finds the addition of other terms in the disputed domain names (here "entreprise" and "ftrades") do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the mark 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 that 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 copycat sites or other types of fraud as in the present case can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1. This is the case regarding the disputed domain names.

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.

In the present case, in consideration of the fact that the Complainant was founded in 1989 and has since been doing business in the retail financial advice market. The Complainant provides an integrated platform of brokerage and investment advisory services to more than 32,000 investment advisors relating to over

USD 2.3 trillion in advisory and brokerage assets, and has over 9,000 employees, it is unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's LPL trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain names were registered on December 4, 2025 and on November 30, 2025 respectively. Therefore, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names in bad faith.

With regard to the requirement that the disputed domain names are being used in bad faith, the Panel finds that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain names as described above constitutes bad faith use under the Policy. [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 constitutes bad faith under the Policy. Accordingly, 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 <lpentreprise.com> and <lpftrades.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Masato Dogauchi/

Masato Dogauchi

Sole Panelist

Date: March 20, 2026