

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LPL Financial LLC v. OOLYE C

Case No. D2026-1411

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is OOLYE C, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lplfinancialserve.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 April 2, 2026. On April 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 2, 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 April 7, 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 April 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 April 14, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 5, 2026.

The Center appointed William A. Van Caenegem as the sole panelist in this matter on May 8, 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 LPL Financial LLC is a retail financial market advisor and a large broker-dealer in the U.S., publicly traded on the NASDAQ. The Complainant provides an integrated platform of brokerage and investment advisory services to more than 32,000 investment advisors including advisors at approximately 1,200 institution-based investment programs and at approximately 570 registered investment advisor firms in the U.S.. It has over 9000 employees.

The Complainant owns numerous domain names including <lpl.com>, registered in 1994, from which it operates its main corporate website, as well as <lpl.net>, <lpl-financial.com>, <lplaccountview.com>, amongst many others. The Complainant's parent company, LPL Holdings, Inc., is the owner of the new gTLDs “.lpl” and “.lplfinancial”. The Complainant also has a substantial social media presence.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for LPL and LPL FINANCIAL, including United States Trademark Registration No. 1801076, LPL, registered on October 26, 1993; United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00003753607, LPL, registered on May 13, 2022; European Union Trade Mark No. 018653022, LPL, registered on May 26, 2022; and United States Trademark Registration No. 3662425, LPL FINANCIAL, registered on August 4, 2009.

The disputed domain name resolves to a parking page provided by GoDaddy with the words “coming soon” displayed in Chinese along with an email contact form.

The Complainant sent a cease and desist notice to the Respondent but received no reply.

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 disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name contains its LPL registered trademark in its entirety and submits that the inclusion of this trademark is sufficient to establish confusing similarity pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy. The Complainant says that the misspelling of the Complainant's LPL FINANCIAL trademark, altered only by the omission of the second occurrence of the letter “n”, creates a high degree of visual and phonetic similarity between the Complainant's LPL FINANCIAL mark and the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent is not licensed or authorized to use its LPL FINANCIAL trademarks in any way and is not affiliated with it. The Respondent has not made prior use of the disputed domain name in relation to the bona fide offering of goods or services, and linking to a parking page amounts to non-use, according to the Complainant. Nor is there any evidence of preparation for legitimate use, according to the Complainant. The Complainant adds that the Respondent's name bears no resemblance to the disputed domain name and there is no evidence that the former had acquired any relevant trademark rights, and the current use of the domain name provides no basis for any claim that the Respondent is known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant also contends that the nature of the disputed domain name is such that it carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant, which does not support any legitimate claim of fair use.

The Complainant contends that its LPL and LPL FINANCIAL trademarks are inherently distinctive and well known in connection with the Complainant's financial advisory services, and adds that its trademarks have been continuously and extensively used for over 30 years, resulting in the acquisition of considerable reputation and goodwill worldwide. The Complainant therefore submits that the Respondent could not credibly argue that it did not have knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark rights when registering the disputed domain name, and that's its use of a proxy server to do so is further evidence of bad faith.

The Complainant then contends that linking to a parking page amounts to non-use of the disputed domain name, which in the present circumstances amounts to bad faith use, the first three factors of *Telstra (Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows, WIPO Case No. D2000-0003)* being satisfied. The Complainant adds that there is no apparent good faith use to which the disputed domain name could be put that would not have the effect of misleading consumers as to its source or affiliation. The Complainant concludes by submitting that the disputed domain name in the hands of the Respondent poses a threat of future misleading and deceptive uses.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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.

Although the addition of other terms here, the misspelt word "finacial", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. The registered trademark LPL is clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name is, in the alternative, nearly identical to the registered trademark LPL FINANCIAL of the Complainant, amounting to a clear example of attempted typosquatting.

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 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 disputed domain name resolves to a parking page, which effectively amounts to non-use. It is difficult to imagine what legitimate use the Respondent could make of a disputed domain name which includes the highly distinctive trademark or marks of the Complainant, and reference to its core activity in financial services. In any case there is no evidence before the Panel of any use of the disputed domain name (or demonstrable plans for such use) in relation to a bona fide offering; of the Respondent being commonly known by the domain name; or of some legitimate noncommercial or fair use by the Respondent.

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 registered a domain name that contains the highly distinctive and long and extensively used registered trademark of the Complainant. Clearly the Respondent was aware at the time of registration, of the financial service activities of the Complainant, and hence of the goodwill attached to LPL as a mark. The registration of the disputed domain name with the inclusion of the deliberately misspelt term "finacial" clearly demonstrates a deliberate attempt to acquire a domain name that had the potential to deceive Internet users.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name, which includes linking to a parking page with only an email contact provided, does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name 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 name <lplfinacialserve.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/William A. Van Caenegem/

William A. Van Caenegem

Sole Panelist

Date: June 20, 2026