

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LPL Financial LLC v. ARMIN AZARNIA

Case No. D2026-0471

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 ARMIN AZARNIA, Canada.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <1p1financial.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 4, 2026. On February 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 5, 2026, 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 (Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 6, 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, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 10, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 12, 2026.

The Center appointed Rodrigo Azevedo as the sole panelist in this matter on March 19, 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 LPL Financial LLC, a United States company founded in 1989 and operating in the financial services sector, providing brokerage and investment advisory services to financial advisors and institutions.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for the marks LPL and LPL FINANCIAL, including, for example, the United States Trademark Registration No. 1801076 for LPL, registered on October 26, 1993; and the United States Trademark Registration No. 3662425 for LPL FINANCIAL, registered on August 4, 2009.

The Complainant also owns and operates domain names incorporating its marks, including its principal domain name <lpl.com>, registered in 1994, from which it operates its main corporate website.

The disputed domain name <1p1financial.com> was registered on August 6, 2025.

The disputed domain name resolves to a parked webpage displaying sponsored links and offering the disputed domain name for sale.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant makes the following contentions:

- The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights. The Complainant asserts that it holds valid trademark rights in the marks LPL and LPL FINANCIAL. The disputed domain name incorporates a visually similar variation of its trademarks, substituting the letter "l" with the numeral "1", which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. The addition of the descriptive term "financial" and the generic Top-Level Domain (".com") does not distinguish the disputed domain name from its trademarks.

- The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized to use the Complainant's trademarks in any manner. The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name and has not made a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name redirects to a webpage featuring sponsored links and containing AI generated articles. Prior UDRP panels have held that the use of a domain name to host a web page comprising sponsored links does not represent a bona fide offering where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant's mark or otherwise mislead Internet users.

- The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks and reputation. The Complainant's LPL and LPL FINANCIAL trademarks are inherently distinctive and well known in connection with the Complainant's financial advisory services. All of the primary search results obtained by typing the term "LPL Financial" into Google's search engine refer to the Complainant. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to host a parked webpage displaying sponsored links and to

offer the disputed domain name for sale, which constitutes evidence of bad faith registration and use under the Policy. Finally, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the disputed domain name to the Complainant, or to a competitor of the Complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that in order to be entitled to a transfer of the disputed domain name, a complainant shall prove the following three elements:

- (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.

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"](#)).

Annex 7 to the Complaint shows registrations for LPL or LPL FINANCIAL trademarks obtained by the Complainant as early as in 1993. Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 trademark LPL FINANCIAL is wholly encompassed within the disputed domain name, substituting the letters "l" on "LPL" with the numeral "1", and with the addition of the generic Top Level-Domain ("gTLD") extension ".com".

The substitution of the letter "l" by the numeral "1" appears to be an intentional misspelling of the Complainant's trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

It is also well established that the addition of a gTLD, such as ".com", is typically disregarded when determining whether a domain name is confusingly similar to a complainant's trademark as such is viewed as a standard registration requirement. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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.

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 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 Complainant has not licensed nor authorized the use of its well-known trademark to the Respondent, and the Panel finds no indication that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name is linked to a website containing written contents related to the Complainant's business, including "A Guide to Modern Financial Services", together with pay-per-click advertisement for "financial services".

Additionally, encompassing a slight variation of the Complainant's trademark LPL FINANCIAL at the disputed domain name, the disputed domain name is misleading and clearly seeks to take advantage of the Complainant's trademark. Such use is not bona fide use.

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.

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 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The Panel concludes that it is not feasible that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant's trademark and that the registration of the disputed domain name was a mere coincidence.

When the disputed domain name was registered (in 2025) the LPL and LPL FINANCIAL trademarks were already connected with the Complainant's financial services.

The disputed domain name is a slight variation of the distinctive trademark LPL FINANCIAL, just substituting the letters "l" by the numeral "1", forming an expression which has no dictionary meaning in English. According to the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4, UDRP panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a famous or widely known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith.

Actually, the content at the website linked to the disputed domain name - including text and advertisement related to financial services – makes it clear that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract the Complainant's customers, for commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website.

Finally, the absence of a formal reply from the Respondent to the Complainant's contentions and of any justification of the use of the trademark further support a finding of bad faith in the present case.

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 <p1financial.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Rodrigo Azevedo/

Rodrigo Azevedo

Sole Panelist

Date: April 2, 2026