

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Lloyd Lifestyle GmbH v. Name Redacted
Case No. D2026-2180

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Name Redacted.¹

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lloydcipo.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 20, 2026. On May 20, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 20, 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 (Super Privacy Service Ltd c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 27, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. On June 1, 2026, the Complainant stated that the alleged disputed domain name registrant denied registering the disputed domain name and claimed misuse of its identity.

The Center verified that 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”).

¹The Respondent appears to have used the name of a third party when registering the disputed domain name. In light of the potential identity theft, the Panel has redacted the Respondent's name from this decision. However, the Panel has attached as Annex 1 to this decision an instruction to the Registrar regarding transfer of the disputed domain name, which includes the name of the Respondent. The Panel has authorized the Center to transmit Annex 1 to the Registrar as part of the order in this proceeding, and has indicated Annex 1 to this decision shall not be published due to the exceptional circumstances of this case. See *Banco Bradesco S.A. v. FAST-12785241 Attn. Bradescourgente.net / Name Redacted*, WIPO Case No. [D2009-1788](#).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 28, 2026. On June 18, 2026, the Center received an email from a third party regarding the identity issue. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center informed the Parties of the commencement of the panel appointment process on June 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Theda König Horowicz as the sole panelist in this matter on July 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 is a company organized under the laws of Germany whose business is the production and sale of shoes, bags, wallets, and clothing worldwide through stationary retail stores as well as online.

The Complainant has registered numerous trademarks relating to its company name and brand LLOYD, including, but not limited to, European Union word/device trademark LLOYD No. 000043810, in class 25, of October 2, 1998.

Moreover, the Complainant owns the domain name <lloyd.com>, which resolves to the Complainant's official website which promotes the Complainant's products and related services internationally.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 2, 2024. At the time of the filing of the Complaint, it resolved to an online shop using the Complainant's LLOYD marks, purportedly selling the same type of goods (shoes, etc.) and having the same "look & feel" than a former website operated by the Complainant.

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 is confusingly similar to the Complainant's LLOYD trademark, as it completely reproduces the latter, with the added term "cipo" which means "shoe" in Hungarian language, thus being descriptive.

Moreover, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name since (i) the Complainant has not granted any license or authorization of any other kind to the Respondent to use its LLOYD trademark, (ii) there has never been any kind of business relationship between the Parties, (iii) the disputed domain name falsely suggests an affiliation with the Complainant, and (iv) it is obvious that the Respondent is simply trying to take advantage of the Complainant's good reputation in its field of business with the intention to create confusion among the Internet users for the Respondent's own benefit.

Finally, the Complainant argues that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith notably since (i) the disputed domain name is being used to operate a fake online shop where counterfeits of the Complainant's products were sold, (ii) the look and feel of the websites under the disputed domain name is also similar to that of the website operated in the past by the Complainant, and (iii) the Complainant's LLOYD trademark enjoys a fairly high degree of distinctiveness and reputation, and it is implausible to think of any good faith of the Respondent when registering and/or using the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions. However, by letter of June 1, 2026, addressed to the Complainant's representatives in these proceedings, the person mentioned as the owner of the disputed domain name with the Registrar declared that it did not register the disputed domain name respectively that its data was misused. The third party requested the transfer of the disputed domain name to the Complainant. In the email to the Center dated June 18, 2026, it provided the same information.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant carries the burden of proving that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Respondent's default in the case at hand does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant, however, paragraph 5(f) of the Rules provides that if the Respondent does not submit a response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute solely based upon the Complaint. Further, according to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences from the Respondent's failure to submit a Response as it considers appropriate.

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 the trademark LLOYD for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's LLOYD trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of the term "cipo" at the end of the disputed domain name ("cipo" meaning "shoes" in Hungarian language) 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. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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.

In particular, the Respondent has not been authorized to use Complainant's LLOYD trademark, either as a domain name or in any other way. Furthermore, the Complainant evidenced that the disputed domain name resolved before the filing of the Complaint to a website operating an online shop where purported Complainant's goods were sold, thereby prominently displaying the Complainant's LLOYD trademark and imitating the look and feel of the Complainant's former official website. The Complainant contends – and the Respondent has not rebutted such contention – that those products were counterfeit.

Such use of the disputed domain name qualifies neither as bona fide nor as legitimate noncommercial or fair use within the meaning of the Policy.

In this context, UDRP panels have long held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, the alleged passing off) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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 was obviously aware of Complainant's rights in its LLOYD trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

The use made of the disputed domain name to operate an online shop where purported Complainant's goods were sold, thereby prominently displaying the Complainant's LLOYD trademark and imitating the look and feel of the Complainant's official website, without any authorization to do so, is a clear indication that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to their own websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's LLOYD trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website. Such circumstances are evidence of registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

In this context, UDRP panels have also long held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, the alleged passing off) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Finally, the case file shows that the Respondent provided false contact information to the Registrar when registering the disputed domain name, using identity theft to this end, which is obviously an additional factor of bad faith finding.

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 <lloydcpo.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Theda König Horowicz/

Theda König Horowicz

Sole Panelist

Date: July 28, 2026