ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
LLOYD Lifestyle GmbH v. Ralf J Kunze, Ralf J Kunze
Case No. D2026-2154

1. The Parties

The Complainant is LLOYD Lifestyle GmbH, Germany, represented by Bird & Bird LLP, Germany.

The Respondent is Ralf J Kunze, Ralf J Kunze, Germany.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lloydau.com> (the "Domain Name") is registered with Hello Internet Corp (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 19, 2026. On May 19, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On June 5, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent ("Registrant details not provided Unknown") and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 5, 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 amendment to the Complaint on June 8, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 30, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 2, 2026.

The Center appointed Ana María Pacón as the sole panelist in this matter on July 3, 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, LLOYD Lifestyle GmbH, is a German company engaged in the manufacture and sale of footwear, as well as bags, wallets, clothing, and related fashion products. The Complainant traces the use of its LLOYD trademark back to 1905 and markets its products worldwide, including through its official website at “www.lloyd.com”.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for LLOYD in various jurisdictions. Among others, the Complainant owns the following trademark registrations:

- European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 019103392 for LLOYD, registered on March 14, 2025, covering goods and services in classes 3, 9, 14, 18, 25, 28, 35 and 45;
- International Trade Mark Registration No. 1722617 for the figurative mark LLOYD GERMANY 1888, registered on November 17, 2022, designating, inter alia, Australia, Canada, the European Union, the United Kingdom, Japan, Mexico, Norway, New Zealand, Türkiye, and the United States of America, covering goods and services in classes 9, 18 and 25.

The Complainant also owns the domain name <lloyd.com>, which was registered on September 18, 1991, and uses it in connection with its official website.

The Domain Name <lloydau.com> was registered on June 18, 2025.

According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, the Domain Name resolved to a website offering footwear bearing the Complainant’s LLOYD trademark. The website prominently displayed a logo highly similar to the Complainant’s figurative trademark LLOYD GERMANY 1888. At the time of this Decision, the Domain Name resolves to an inactive webpage.

The Registrar disclosed the underlying registrant as Ralf J Kunze, Germany. Prior to such disclosure, the registrant’s identity had been concealed through a privacy service.

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 Name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to its LLOYD trademarks because it incorporates the trademark LLOYD in its entirety. The addition of the term “au”, commonly understood as an abbreviation for Australia, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity. According to the Complainant, this term may rather lead Internet users to believe that the Domain Name corresponds to an Australian website of the Complainant.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. The Respondent has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the Complainant’s LLOYD trademarks, and there has never been any business relationship between the parties. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent is not commonly known by the Domain Name and that its use falsely suggests an affiliation with the Complainant.

Finally, the Complainant submits that the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. According to the Complainant, the Domain Name resolved to an online shop offering purported LLOYD footwear for sale. The website displayed the LLOYD designation and a logo highly similar to the Complainant’s figurative trademark, and imitated the look and feel of a former online shop operated by the Complainant. The Complainant alleges that the website offered counterfeit products and was intended to

mislead Internet users into believing that it was operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant.
The Complainant further relies on the prior use and reputation of its LLOYD trademarks, the Respondent's initial concealment of its identity, and the absence of any plausible good-faith explanation for the registration and use of the Domain Name.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the Domain Name.

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 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 the LLOYD trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's LLOYD trademark in its entirety. The Panel finds that the trademark is clearly recognizable within the Domain Name. Accordingly, the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The addition of the letters "au", a commonly used abbreviation for Australia, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.8. On the contrary, in the circumstances of this case, the addition of this geographical abbreviation may even reinforce the impression that the Domain Name refers to an Australian website operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant. This consideration is more appropriately addressed under the second and third elements of the Policy.

Then there is the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), here ".com". As is generally accepted, the addition of a gTLD such as ".com" is merely a technical registration requirement and as such is typically disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1, and *Accenture Global Services Limited v. Fan zhi*, WIPO Case No. D2024-0285.

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 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 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 Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The Complainant has confirmed that it has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its LLOYD trademark or to register any domain name incorporating that mark. There is also no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the Domain Name.

The evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that the Domain Name resolved to a website prominently displaying the Complainant's LLOYD trademark and purporting to offer LLOYD-branded footwear. Such use is not a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Domain Name. See WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 2.5.1 and 2.13.1.

Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, including the sale of counterfeit goods or other forms of impersonation, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 2.5.1 and 2.13.1.

The Panel finds that 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 was more likely than not aware of the Complainant and its LLOYD trademark when registering the Domain Name. The Complainant's LLOYD trademark had been registered and used for many years prior to the registration of the Domain Name and has acquired a considerable reputation in the footwear sector. The Domain Name wholly incorporates the Complainant's distinctive trademark together with the geographical abbreviation "au", which may suggest an Australian website of the Complainant. The composition of the Domain Name itself carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1.

The evidence further shows that the Domain Name resolved to a website prominently displaying the Complainant's LLOYD trademark together with a logo highly similar to the Complainant's figurative trademark. The website imitated the appearance of the Complainant's former online shop and purported to offer LLOYD-branded footwear for sale. The Panel finds that such use was intended to create the false impression that the website was operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant, with a view to attracting Internet users for commercial gain.

The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the products offered thereon, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The fact that the Domain Name is currently inactive does not prevent a finding of bad faith. The Respondent's prior use of the Domain Name, together with the circumstances of this case, including the composition of the Domain Name, the imitation of the Complainant's website, the absence of any rights or legitimate interests, and the Respondent's failure to participate in this proceeding, support a finding of registration and use in bad faith.

In these circumstances, the Panel considers it implausible to conceive of any plausible good-faith use of the Domain Name by the Respondent.

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 Domain Name <lloydau.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ana María Pacón/
Ana María Pacón
Sole Panelist
Date: July 17, 2026