ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LLOYD Lifestyle GmbH v. Stills Uohn, Aobert Kinley, Boland Uhristopher, Tressleras Aandra, Flordus Mary, Zhavez Sheresa
Case No. D2026-2155

1. The Parties

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

The Respondents are Stills Uohn, Aobert Kinley, Boland Uhristopher, Tressleras Aandra, Flordus Mary and Zhavez Sheresa, United States of America.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <de-lloyd.com>, <itlloyd.com>, <lloyd-de.com>, <lloyd-fr.com>, <lloyd-it.com> and <lloyd-nl.com> (the “Domain Names”) are registered with Gname.com Pte. Ltd. (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 Names. On May 19, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Names which differed from the named Respondent (“Registrant details redacted for privacy, Privacy Service: Gname.com Pte. Ltd.”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 22, 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 5, 2026.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 22, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, 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 amendment on June 5, 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 5, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 11, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 30, 2026.

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on July 16, 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 German shoe manufacturer that sells shoes and products such as bags, wallets or clothing. The Complainant's products are sold in retail stores and online on the website "www.lloyd.com." The Complainant sells its products worldwide. The Complainant has been using the trademark LLOYD since 1905.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations that contain the term "lloyd", such as European Union registration number 019103392 (registered on March 14, 2025). In addition to its LLOYD trademarks the Complainant has also registered the domain name <lloyd.com>.

The Domain Names have been registered in the period between November 28, 2025, and February 7, 2026. The Complainant has documented that the Domain Names have resolved to websites with fake online shops offering what appear to be counterfeit versions of the Complainant's goods and the Complainant's trademark is displayed without authorization. At the time of the Decision, the Domain Names resolved to error pages.

As mentioned above, the Domain Names are associated with different underlying registrants. The Complainant argues that all Domain Names are under common control. As seen below, the Panel agrees with the Complainant and decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants in a single proceeding. For simplicity, the registrants will therefore be referred to as "the Respondent" in singular form, if not specified otherwise.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant argues that the Domain Names are under common control of the same person or entity.

The Domain Names appear to be registered with wrong names and addresses. In five cases, the Registrant's name is spelled incorrectly. This cannot, in the Complainant's view, be a coincidence. The Complainant concludes that false and inaccurate information was deliberately provided in order to conceal the actual registrant as is not uncommon for fake shop operators.

The Complainant documents registered trademark rights in LLOYD. The Domain Names completely reproduce the Complainant's trademark. The fact that parts of the Complainant's trademarks are device trademarks is not sufficient in the present case to deny an identity between the signs. The additional terms "it", "fr", "de", and "nl" will not eliminate the similarity. The public in Italy, France, Germany, and the Netherlands (Kingdom of the) will assume that the Domain Names lead to the national websites of the Complainant.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Names. The Complainant has not licensed or authorized the Respondent to use its trademark.

There has never been any kind of business relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent. The Domain Names falsely suggest an affiliation with the Complainant.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has registered the Domain Names merely to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the trademarks, domain name and company name of the Complainant. The Complainant's mark enjoys a high degree of distinctiveness and reputation. The Respondent's concealing of its identity and presumably uses false contact details. It is implausible the Domain Names may be used by the Respondent in good faith. The Complainant asserts that it is clear that the Respondent did act in bad faith when registering and using the Domain Names.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Consolidation

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 of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("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 time span with the same Registrar. The registrants have listed what appear to be incomplete/wrong contact details, and there are similarities within the contact details. All Domain Names are similar in structure. Importantly, the Domain Names have been used for the same purpose and for websites offering unauthorized sale of the Complainant's products. This points to the fact 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 in a single proceeding.

6.2. Substantive 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 LLOYD. The Domain Names incorporate the Complainant's trademark, with the additions of "de-", "it", "-de", "-fr", "-it" and "-nl". The additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Names and the trademark. For the purpose of assessing the confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel may ignore the Top-Level Domains. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.

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. 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 clear 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 prove that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant when the Respondent registered them. The use of the Domain Names for unauthorized sale of the Complainant's products, without disclosing the Respondent's lack of relationship with the trademark owner and displaying the Complainant's trademark on the websites at the Domain Names, is clear evidence of bad faith under the Policy.

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 that the Domain Names <de-lloyd.com>, <itlloyd.com>, <lloyd-de.com>, <lloyd-fr.com>, <lloyd-it.com> and <lloyd-nl.com> transferred to the Complainant.

/Mathias Lilleengen/
Mathias Lilleengen
Sole Panelist
Date: July 22, 2026