

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Loop B.V. v. Joanne Stubbs, Whoisprotection.cc, Domain Admin, Robert Eberhardt, Becker Adler, Eisenberg Fiedler, Herzog Goldschmidt, Hertzog Ostermann, 吴鹒 (wu yi / wuyi), Fraser Oliver, Oliver Fraser, 徐景波, 黄保传, 徐辉

Case No. D2026-0360

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are Joanne Stubbs, Germany ("Alias 1"), Whoisprotection.cc, Domain Admin, Malaysia ("Alias 2"), Robert Eberhardt, Germany ("Alias 3"), Becker Adler, Germany ("Alias 4"), Eisenberg Fiedler, Germany ("Alias 5"), Herzog Goldschmidt, Germany ("Alias 6"), Hertzog Ostermann, Germany ("Alias 7"), 吴鹒 (wu yi / wuyi), China ("Alias 8"), Fraser Oliver, Oliver Fraser, Germany ("Alias 9"), 徐景波, China ("Alias 10"), 黄保传, China ("Alias 11"), 徐辉, China ("Alias 12").

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <engagedkshop.com>, <loopearplugs-fi.com>, <loopearplugs-italia.com>, <loop-ear-plugs-nederland.com> and <loopearplugsouthafrica.com> are registered with Vantage of Convergence (Chengdu) Technology Co., Ltd. ("Registrar A").

The disputed domain names <loopearplugosterreich.com> and <loopearplugs-greece.com> are registered with NameSilo, LLC ("Registrar B").

The disputed domain names <loopearplugsbelgie.com>, <loopearplugsfinland.com>, <loopearplugs-japan.com>, <loopearplugsmexico.com>, <loopearplugs-nz.com> are registered with Dynadot Inc ("Registrar C").

The disputed domain name <loopearplugs-belgium.com> is registered with Hongkong Kouming International Limited ("Registrar D").

The disputed domain name <loopearplugs-canada.com> is registered with CNOBIN Information Technology Limited ("Registrar E").

The disputed domain name <loopearplugs-hungary.com> is registered with Dominet (HK) Limited ("Registrar F").

The disputed domain name <loop-earplugsschweiz.com> is registered with Xin Net Technology Corporation (“Registrar G”).

All above-mentioned disputed domain names are collectively referred to as the “Domain Names”. Registrars A, B, C, D, E, F and G are collectively referred to as the “Registrar”.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 28, 2026. On January 29, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Names. On January 29 and 30, February 3, 5 and 6, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by emails to the Center its verification disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Names which partially differed from the named Respondents (Joanne Stubbs, Wilayah Persekutuan, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot, Privacy User #279830ab, See PrivacyGuardian.org, Anonymous) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 6, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the 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 amended Complaints and the amendment to the Complaint in English on February 10, and March 18 and 20, 2026.

On February 6, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the Domain Names <loopearplugs-belgium.com>, <loop-earplugsschweiz.com>, <loop-ear-plugs-nederland.com>, <loopearplugs-italia.com>, <engagedkshop.com>, <loopearplugs-fi.com>, <loopearplugsouthafrica.com> is Chinese. On February 10, 2026, the Complainant requested English to be the language of the proceeding. The Respondents did not submit any comment on the Complainant’s submission.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints and the amendment to the 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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 13, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on April 15, 2026.

The Center appointed Karen Fong as the sole panelist in this matter on April 22, 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

Founded in 2016, the Complainant is a Belgian life sciences technology company focused on earplugs, earwear, and more broadly, hearing technology. Since its inception, the Complainant has sold more than eight million earplugs globally under the brand LOOP. The Complainant currently markets its products in over 150 countries including Germany and China where the Respondents are apparently based. In 2024, the Complainant reported new sales of approximately EUR 200 million.

The earplugs have been endorsed by The New York Times as “the best earplugs for concerts”. The Complainant was named in Fast Company’s list of the World’s Most Innovative Companies of 2024.

Besides the LOOP trade mark, the Complainant also markets and distributes one of its products under the brand ENGAGE.

The LOOP and ENGAGE brands are registered as trade marks in many jurisdictions around the world. The LOOP trade mark registrations include the following:

- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 15088693 for LOOP registered on May 24, 2016; and
- International Trade Mark Registration No 1626467 for LOOP registered on October 4, 2021; (individually and collectively, the “LOOP Mark”).

The ENGAGE trade mark registrations include the following:

- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 18928215 for ENGAGE registered on January 6, 2024; and
- International Trade Mark Registration No 1785725 for ENGAGE registered on March 14, 2024; (individually and collectively, the “ENGAGE Mark”). The LOOP Mark and ENGAGE Mark are individually and collectively referred to as the “Trade Mark”.

The Complainant owns several domain names which incorporate the LOOP Mark and the descriptive words “earplugs”. Its official website is found at the domain name <loopearplugs.com>.

The Domain Names and the websites they resolve to (the “Websites”) are set out below. (Note: The evidence does not include website printouts for every Domain Name. Further, certain printouts provided do not clearly indicate which Domain Name they correspond to):

No.	Domain Name	Creation Date	Registrant Alias No.	Registrar No.	Websites and Comments
1	<engagedkshop.com>	December 8, 2025	Alias 11	A	Resolved to an e-commerce website offering for sale earplugs bearing the LOOP Mark at a discounted price and displaying copyrighted images taken from the Complainant’s website. The Website bears the LOOP Mark and the ENGAGE Mark.
2	<loopearplugosterreich.com>	December 18, 2025	Alias 4	B	No evidence submitted.
3	<loopearplugsbelgie.com>	October 13, 2025	Alias 3	C	No evidence submitted. Email address contains random letters followed by “@rambler.ru”.
4	<loopearplugs-belgium.com>	October 13, 2025	Alias 1	D	Resolved to an e-commerce website offering for sale earplugs bearing

					<p>the LOOP Mark at a discounted price and displaying copyrighted images taken from the Complainant's website.</p> <p>The Website bears the LOOP Mark and the ENGAGE Mark.</p>
5	<loopearplugs-canada.com>	September 25, 2025	Alias 9	E	<p>Resolved to an e-commerce website offering for sale earplugs bearing the LOOP Mark and displaying copyrighted images taken from the Complainant's website.</p> <p>The Website bears the LOOP Mark and the ENGAGE Mark.</p>
6	<loopearplugs-fi.com>	December 14, 2025	Alias 11	A	Almost identical to Website 4.
7	<loopearplugsfinland.com>	October 13, 2025	Alias 6	C	No evidence submitted. Same type of email address as Domain Name 3, containing random letters followed by "@rambler.ru".
8	<loopearplugs-greece.com>	October 14, 2025	Alias 5	B	No evidence submitted. Same type of email address as Domain Name 3, containing random letters followed by "@163.com".
9	<loopearplugs-hungary.com>	October 8, 2025	Alias 2	F	Almost identical to Website 4.
10	<loopearplugs-italia.com>	November 6, 2025	Alias 10	A	<p>Resolved to an e-commerce website offering for sale earplugs bearing the LOOP Mark at a discounted price and displaying copyrighted images taken from the Complainant's website.</p> <p>The Website bears the LOOP Mark and the ENGAGE Mark.</p>
11	<loopearplugs-japan.com>	October 16, 2025	Alias 1	C	No evidence submitted. Same registrant as Domain Name 4 and 14.

12	<loopearplugs-mexico.com>	October 13, 2025	Alias 7	C	No evidence submitted. Same type of email address as Domain Name 3, containing random letters followed by "@rambler.ru".
13	<loop-ear-plugs-nederland.com>	November 6, 2025	Alias 10	A	Almost identical to Website 10.
14	<loopearplugs-nz.com>	October 13, 2025	Alias 1	C	Almost identical to Website 4.
15	<loopearplugs-southafrica.com>	October 30, 2025	Alias 12	A	No evidence submitted. Same type of email address as Domain Name 3, containing random letters followed by "@hotmail.com".
16	<loop-earplugsschweiz.com>	October 16, 2025	Alias 8	G	Almost identical to Website 4.

As claimed by the Complainant, following take-down notices submitted by the Complainant, some of the Domain Names have been deactivated and are currently inactive.

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 Domain Names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Trade Mark in which it has rights, that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the Domain Names, and that the Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith. The Complainant requests transfer of the Domain Names.

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 second 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 Domain Name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The 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 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 Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes the following:

- (1) All the Domain Names incorporate either the LOOP Mark or the ENGAGE Mark as part of the Domain Names;
- (2) All the Domain Names were registered through the Registrar between September 25 and December 18, 2025;
- (3) Many of the email addresses of the Respondents are free public email accounts such as hotmail.com / mail.ru / rambler.ru / outlook.com / yeah.net which is inconsistent with the practice of legitimate commercial entities registering domain names;
- (4) Many of the Domain Names resolve to Websites which mimic the Complainant's website and purport to be online stores selling the Complainant's products at discounted prices, displaying the Trade Mark and using copyrighted images belonging to the Complainant.
- (5) Most of the Domain Names which include the LOOP Mark have the same naming structure which comprise the LOOP Mark, the descriptive element "earplugs" and a geographical term.
- (6) The 16 Domain Names are registered in 12 names and with seven Registrars.
- (7) Domain Name 1 which is the only Domain Name which incorporates the ENGAGE Mark has the same registrant name as Domain Name 6.
- (8) The contact details of the registrants suggest that the identities of the named individuals or entities may be fabricated. The reasons include the following: postal codes do not correspond to the named cities, email addresses with meaningless strings of letters that appear to have no relation to the named individuals or entities which is common for fictitious identities, some of the Domain Names are registered using privacy or proxy services which obscure the identity of the underlying registrants.
- (9) The Respondents failed to file any Response.

The evidence submitted points to the fact that all the Domain Names are subject of common control by the Respondents. The above pattern evidences common conduct based on the registration and use of the Domain Names and that such conduct interferes with the Trade Mark. The Respondents had the opportunity but did not respond to the Complaint. 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 Domain Name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

B. Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for some Domain Names is Chinese. 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 was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English. It is noted that nine out of the 16 Domain Names were registered with Registration Agreements in English and eight out of the 12 registrants have addresses outside of China. It is also noted that all the Websites are in English. Given that all the Domain Names are under the common control of the Respondent, this is a clear indication that the Respondent is familiar and understands the English language.

The Respondent has not challenged the Complainant's language request and in fact has failed to file a Response in either English or Chinese.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the 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 3.1](#), 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

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the entirety of the Trade Mark is reproduced within the Domain Names. Accordingly, the Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of the terms "earplugs", "earplug", "dkshop", "fi", "italia", "nederland", "southafrica", "osterreich", "greece", "belgie", "finland", "japan", "mexico", "nz", "belgium", "canada", "hungary", "schweiz" after the Trade Mark may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of these terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Names and the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Based on the available record, 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.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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 record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the 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 Domain Names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise. Based on the available 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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent must have been aware of the Trade Mark when it registered the Domain Names given the reputation of the Trade Mark and the fact that all but one of the 16 Domain Names have the words "earplug" or "earplugs" which is the core product of the Complainant. It is therefore implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant when it registered the Domain Names.

In the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2 states as follows:

"Noting the near instantaneous and global reach of the Internet and search engines, and particularly in circumstances where the complainant's mark is widely known (including in its sector) or highly specific and a respondent cannot credibly claim to have been unaware of the mark (particularly in the case of domainers), panels have been prepared to infer that the respondent knew, or have found that the respondent should have known, that its registration would be identical or confusingly similar to a complainant's mark. Further factors including the nature of the domain name, the chosen top-level domain, any use of the domain name, or any respondent pattern, may obviate a respondent's claim not to have been aware of the complainant's mark."

The fact that there is a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with the Respondent's choice of the 16 Domain Names without any explanation is also a significant factor to consider (as stated in [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1). The Domain Names fall into the category stated above and the Panel finds that the registration is in bad faith.

The Domain Names are also being used in bad faith. The unauthorised use of the Complainant's Trade Mark, its copyrighted images and offer for sale of the Complainant's products on the Websites without authorisation are calculated to mislead Internet users to believe its affiliation with the Complainant. Further, the large number of Domain Names involved is a clear indication of a serial cybersquatting ring.

The content of some of the Websites was calculated to give the impression they have been authorised by or connected to the Complainant when this is not the case. These Websites were set up to deliberately mislead Internet users that they are connected to, authorised by, or affiliated with the Complainant. The Respondent employed the fame of the Trade Mark to mislead Internet users into visiting the Websites instead of the Complainant's official website particularly as the Websites do not have any information as to the lack of relationship with the Complainant. From the above, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, by misleading Internet users into believing that the Websites and the products purportedly offered for sale and sold on them are those of or authorised or endorsed by the Complainant.

It is highly likely that Internet users, when typing the Domain Names into their browser or finding them through a search engine, would have been looking for a site operated by the Complainant rather than the Respondent. The Domain Names are likely to confuse Internet users trying to find the Complainant's official website. Such confusion will inevitably result due to the fact that all the Domain Names comprise the Trade Mark as the dominant element.

The Panel therefore also concludes that the Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 Domain Names <engagedkshop.com>, <loopearplugosterreich.com>, <loopearplugsbelgie.com>, <loopearplugs-belgium.com>, <loopearplugs-canada.com>, <loopearplugs-fi.com>, <loopearplugsfinland.com>, <loopearplugs-greece.com>, <loopearplugs-hungary.com>, <loopearplugs-italia.com>, <loopearplugs-japan.com>, <loopearplugs-mexico.com>, <loop-ear-plugs-nederland.com>, <loopearplugs-nz.com>, <loopearplugsouthafrica.com> and <loop-earplugsschweiz.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Karen Fong/

Karen Fong

Sole Panelist

Date: May 18, 2026