

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LPL Financial LLC v. Leonard Bosack
Case No. D2026-2033

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Leonard Bosack, Nepal.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lplfinance.business> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 12, 2026. On May 12, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 12, 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 (Privacy User #a105272f) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 13, 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 May 18, 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 May 20, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 9, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Peter Burgstaller as the sole panelist in this matter on June 12, 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 a United States of America based leader in the retail financial advice market (Annex 4 to the Complaint). It owns various trademark registrations containing the mark LPL and/or LPL FINANCIAL, inter alia:

- United States of America Trademark for LPL (word), Registration No. 1801076, registered on October 26, 1993;
- United Kingdom Trademark for LPL (word), Registration No. UK00003753607, registered on May 13, 2022;
- European Union Trade Mark for LPL (word), No. 018653022, registered on May 26, 2022;
- United States of America Trademark for LPL FINANCIAL (word), Registration No 3662425, registered on August 4, 2009; and
- United Kingdom Trademark LPL FINANCIAL (word), Registration No. UK00003753611, registered on May 13, 2022 (Annex 7 to the Complaint).

The Complainant has also a strong presence online, it owns various domain names containing the mark LPL and LPL FINANCIAL, inter alia <lpl.com> from which it operates its main corporate website, as well as the domain names <lpl.net>, <lplfinancial.com>, <lpl-financial.com> or <lplaccountview.com> (Annex 5 to the Complaint). The Complainant is also active on various social media platforms e.g. Facebook, LinkedIn or YouTube and X (Annex 6 to the Complaint).

The disputed domain name was registered on March 10, 2026 (Annex 1 to the Complaint). At the time of filing the Complaint the disputed domain name did not resolve to an active webpage (Annex 8 to the Complaint).

On April 24, 2026, the Complainant's lawyers sent a notice to the Respondent via the Registrar's registrant contact form; the Respondent did not respond (Annex 9 to the Complaint).

A Mail Exchange ("MX") records is configured for the disputed domain name (Annex 11 to the Complaint).

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the LPL and/or LPL FINANCIAL trademark is distinctive and well known; it notes that the disputed domain name contains the LPL trademark in its entirety and simply adding the descriptive word "finance" as suffix to the mark LPL which cannot eliminate the confusing similarity between the Complainant's trademarks LPL and LPL FINANCIAL and the disputed domain name. Moreover, the Complainant's trademark registrations as well as domain name registrations which contain the LPL and LPL FINANCIAL mark are prior to the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant submits that especially because of the distinctiveness of the Complainant and its trademarks it is inconceivable that the Respondent would not have been aware of the Complainant's trademarks when registering the disputed domain name, or that there would be any legitimate use for the disputed domain name. Further, the Complainant has never assigned, granted, licensed, sold, transferred or in any way authorized the Respondent to use the LPL or LPL FINANCIAL trademark in any manner.

Finally, the Complainant notes that the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website and is therefore not used for a bona fide offering of goods or services; moreover, the passive holding of a domain name which contains distinctive and well-known trademarks may amount to bad faith. Moreover, the Complainant notes the Respondent's activation of MX records for the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainants must prove that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainants have rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to 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, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of the marks LPL and LPL FINANCIAL for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

In the present case, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to these marks in which the Complainant has rights since it incorporates the entirety of the mark LPL and only adds the descriptive word "finance" to the LPL mark and is also visually similar to the Complainant's mark LPL FINANCIAL.

It has long been established under UDRP decisions that where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the mere addition of other terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. That is the case here; the LPL mark of the Complainant is clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name.

Finally, it has also long been held that generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") (in this case ".business") are generally disregarded when evaluating the confusing similarity of a disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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 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 Complainant focuses on the fact that its trademark is distinctive and well-known and provides suitable evidence of its reputation, adding that it is inconceivable that the Respondent would not have been aware of this when registering the disputed domain name. The Complainant also notes that the disputed domain name is not being used for a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The nature of the disputed domain name, comprising the Complainant’s mark plus the descriptive term “finance”, signal the Respondent’s intention to create an implied affiliation with the Complainant and its company.

Finally, the Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing, it did not respond to the Complainant’s notice via the Registrar’s registrant contact form 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 Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

As stated in paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the Complainant must show registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith. These are concurrent requirements.

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 Complainant has rights and is the owner of the marks LPL and LPL FINANCIAL, which are registered and used in many jurisdictions around the world long before the registration of the disputed domain name. Moreover, the Complainant registered and is using domain names containing the mark LPL, especially <lpl.com> to host its official website and has a strong online presence also on the social media platforms Facebook, LinkedIn, YouTube or X.

It is inconceivable for this Panel that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant’s rights, which leads to the necessary inference of bad faith. This finding is supported by the fact that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant’s distinctive trademark LPL in its entirety and merely adds the descriptive term “finance” at the end which even strengthens the impression that the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its mark when registering the disputed domain name. Finally, a simple online search for “lpl” would have shown the

Complainant and its marks. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.3. Therefore, the Panel is convinced that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith by the Respondent.

Although there is no evidence that the disputed domain name is being actively used or resolved to a website with substantive content, UDRP panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or “coming soon” or “parking” page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding.

Panelists look especially at the totality of the circumstances in each case, factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant’s mark, (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, (iii) the respondent’s taking active steps to conceal its identity or (iv) the use of false or inaccurate contact details. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

On the basis of the evidence and documents put forward in the Complaint, the Panel finds that especially the following aspects do not prevent a finding of bad faith use under the Policy:

- the Complainant has a strong online presence;
- the Complainant’s trademarks LPL and LPL FINANCIAL are distinctive;
- the disputed domain name incorporates the LPL mark in its entirety and is very similar to the LPL FINANCIAL mark of the Complainant;
- the Respondent did not submit a Response; and
- the disputed domain name has active MX records, as shown in the MX records lookup, which indicates a possible use for email services.

Taking the above factors into consideration and the nature of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds it implausible that the disputed domain name may be put in good faith use,

Therefore, the Panel is convinced that the disputed domain name was used in bad faith by the Respondent.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that 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 disputed domain name <lplfinance.business> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Peter Burgstaller/

Peter Burgstaller

Sole Panelist

Date: June 23, 2026