WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

**ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER**

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LPL Financial LLC v. Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC, Sergio Ernandes, Wise and Valdez LLC, Voluptas Excepteu, Wise and Valdez LLC
Case No. D2026-1370

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 Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC, Saint Kitts and Nevis; Sergio Ernandes, Wise and Valdez LLC, Ukraine; and Voluptas Excepteu, Wise and Valdez LLC, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <aff-finance-lpl.com>, <aff-financeslpl.com>, <crm-financeslpl.com>, and <financeslpl.com>, are registered with Tucows Domains Inc.

The disputed domain names <crm-financiales-lpl.com>, <aff-financiales-lpl.com>, <financialeslpl.com>, <financiales-lpl.com> are registered with Dynadot Inc.

Tucows Domains Inc and Dynadot Inc will collectively be referred herein as the “Registrars”. The disputed will collectively be referred herein as the “Domain Names”.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 31, 2026. On March 31, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars requests for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Names. On March 31, 2026, and April 14, 2026, the Registrars transmitted to the Center the verification response providing registrant and contact information for the Domain Names which differed from the named Respondent (Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 17, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints 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 an amended Complaint on April 28, 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/registrants of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 8, 2026. The Respondent/registrants did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on June 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on June 11, 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 to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a large independent broker-dealer. It was founded in 1989 through the merger of two brokerage firms (Linsco and Private Ledger). Since 2010, the Complainant has been publicly traded on the NASDAQ under "LPLA". The Complainant has over 9,000 employees and in the fourth quarter of 2025, its gross profit reached over USD 1.54 billion.

The Complainant is the owner of trademark registrations for LPL and LPL FINANCIAL in different jurisdictions, such as United States Trademark Registration No. 1801076 (registered on October 26,1993) and United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00003753607 (registered on May 13, 2022), and United States Trademark Registration No. 3662425 (registered on August 4, 2009).

The Complainant owns many domain names consisting of or containing "LPL", such as <lpl.com>, <lpl.net>, <lpl-financial.com>, <lplfinancial.com>, and <lplaccountview.com>. The Complainant's parent company, LPL Holdings, Inc., is the owner of the branded new generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") ".lpl" and ".lplfinancial". Moreover, the Complainant is present on various social-media platforms.

The Domain Names have been registered in the period between December 17, 2025, and February 5, 2026.

The Complainant has documented that some of the Domain Names resolved to similar websites that feature the Complainant's logo. Some of the websites encourage Internet users to "Get Account" and "Login" to deposit money and to trade on the platform, featured the street address of the Complainant's South Carolina office, as well as the email address "[…]@financelpl.com". The remaining Domain Names resolve(d) to inactive pages.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant argues that the Domain Names are under common control of the same person or entity. The disputed domain names <aff-financiales-lpl.com>, <crm-financiales-lpl.com>, <financiales-lpl.com> and <financialeslpl.com> were registered in the name of an organization called Wise and Valdez LLC. The remaining four disputed domain names were registered using the proxy service Njalla Okta LLC. The disputed domain names <aff-financiales-lpl.com>, <financiales-lpl.com>, and <crm-financiales-lpl.com> resolve to very similar websites that impersonate the Complainant displaying the same email address. The disputed domain names <aff-financeslpl.com> and <aff-finance-lpl.com> have resolved to very similar websites that impersonated the Complainant and purported to offer a financial trading platform. The Domain Names were registered within a 7-week period, following a similar naming pattern. The Complainant argues that to require the Complainant to file separate complaints would cause the Complainant to incur considerable additional time and expense, running contrary to the aim of the Policy to provide a time- and cost-effective means for resolving domain name disputes. The Complainant requests for a single consolidated Complaint against the registrants (collectively referred to below as the "Respondent").

The Complainant documents registered trademark rights in LPL and LPL FINANCIAL. The Domain Names incorporate the Complainant's trademark. The Domain Names differ from the trademark by the addition of terms like "aff-", "finance", "financiales" and the like. The Complainant argues that the additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the trademark for the purposes of the Policy.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Names. The Respondent is not using the Domain Names in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services. The Complainant has not licensed or authorized the Respondent to use its trademark. The Complainant submits that the Respondent's attempt to hold itself out as a genuine financial services and investment provider under the Complainant's name and using the Complainant's trademarks carries a high risk that unsuspecting Internet users will be misled into making payments to the Respondent for services that the Respondent has no intention of providing, commonly known as an advance-fee scheme, which cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services. Furthermore, the Respondent's current non-use of some of the Domain Names in connection with active web pages does not constitute a bona fide use. The Respondent has not been commonly known by the Domain Names. Nor is the Respondent making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Names, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers, within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. The Complainant submits that the nature of the Domain Names is such that they carry a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant, which does not support any legitimate claim of fair use of the Domain Names.

The Complainant argues that its trademarks are well-known in connection with the Complainant's financial advisory services. The Respondent could not credibly argue that it did not have knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark rights when registering the Domain Names. The Respondent's intent to target the Complainant is also apparent from the composition of the Domain Names. Moreover, given the similarities between the Respondent's websites and the websites to which the five domain names resolved in the prior case *LPL Financial LLC v. Afina Cial, Host Master, Njalla Okta LLC*, WIPO Case No. D2025-5329 featuring the same logo, layout, graphics and email address, the Complainant infers that the Domain Names were registered by the same registrant as in that case. The registration of a total of 13 LPL-formative domain names, as well as the fact that seven out of eight of the Domain Names were registered after the filing of the previous UDRP Complaint is further evidence of bad faith. The Complainant further submits that the fact that the underlying registrant details for some of the Domain Names feature street addresses that do not appear to exist as detailed above, indicates that the Domain Names have been registered using false registrant information, which is additional evidence of bad faith. The use of the Domain Names proves that the Respondent has attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites to which the Domain Names resolve(d), in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The fact that two of the Domain Names no longer resolve to active web pages does not cure the Respondent's bad faith, per WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 3.3.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Matters

The Panel notes that one of the domain name registrants seems to to be located in Ukraine. Noting that Ukraine is subject to an international conflict at the date of this Decision, the Panel is to consider, in accordance with paragraph 10 of the Rules, whether the proceeding should continue.

Under paragraph 10 of the Rules, the Panel is required to ensure that the Parties are treated with equality and that each Party is given a fair opportunity to present its case, and also that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition.

The Panel notes that even if the courier was not able to deliver the Written Notice of the Complaint to the registrant's address in Ukraine, the Notification of Complaint has been delivered to the email addresses listed for that domain name registrant. Moreover, the registrant listed as "Wise and Valdez LLC" also is listed with an address in California. The Panel is not sure if the registrant has listed genuine or fake contact details. Be that as it may, the registrant has not opposed the continuation of the proceeding. The Panel takes note that the Domain Names registered by that registrant were registered after the outbreak of the international conflict. The Panel further notes that the use of the Domain Names has changed, indicating that the domain name registrant appears to have had control of the Domain Names. Moreover, as described below, the Panel believes the registrant has registered the Domain Names in bad faith to target the Complainant and mislead consumers. The Panel concludes that the Parties have been given a fair opportunity to present their case, and so that the administrative proceeding takes place with due expedition the Panel will proceed to a Decision accordingly.

The Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant argues that the domain name registrants are the same entity or under common control. The Complainant requests consolidation of the disputes against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules. 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 3.1", section 4.11.2.

As regards the common control, the Panel notes that the Domain Names were registered within a short period of time. All Domain Names are similar in structure. Importantly, the Domain Names have been used in similar manners, either to resolve to similar webpages that target the Complainant, or have remained inactive. Under the circumstances, it suggests that the Domain Names are under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party. The different domain name registrants have not objected to the Complainant's consolidation request.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

6.2 .Substantial Issues

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain names. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The Complainant has established registered trademark rights in LPL and LPL FINANCIAL. The Domain Names incorporate the Complainant's trademark, with the addition of terms such as "aff-", "finance", "financiales". None of the additions prevents a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Names and the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant's trademark remains recognizable within the Domain Names. For the purpose of assessing the confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel may ignore the gTLD. See WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 1.8, and 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. 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. See 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 showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. Based on the available record, the Respondent is not affiliated with or related to the Complainant. There is no evidence that the Respondent has registered the Domain Names as a trademark or acquired trademark rights. There is no evidence of the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Names or names corresponding to the Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent's use is rather evidence of bad faith, see below.

Moreover, the composition of the Domain Names carries a risk of implied affiliation. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

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.

The composition and use of the Domain Names indicates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant when the Respondent registered the Domain Names. The use of some of the Domain Names to resolve to webpages impersonating the Complainant is clear evidence of bad faith use under the Policy. The Panel finds that the Respondent has attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's websites. The Panel further finds that the fact that some of the Domain Names did not resolve to active webpages does not prevent a bad faith finding here noting specially the well-known status of the Complainant's trademarks and the composition of such Domain Names.

For the reasons set out above, the Panel concludes that the Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

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 the Domain Names<aff-finance-lpl.com>, <aff-financeslpl.com>, <crm-financeslpl.com>, <financeslpl.com>, <crm-financiales-lpl.com>, <aff-financiales-lpl.com>, <financialeslpl.com>, and <financiales-lpl.com> transferred to the Complainant.

/Mathias Lilleengen/
Mathias Lilleengen
Sole Panelist
Date: June 19, 2026