

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LOOP B.V. v. Daniels Finley, Finley Daniels, 黄保传 (bao chuan huang), 徐景波 (Xu Jingbo), 徐红梅, 徐辉, 吴鹂 (wu yi), Domain Admin, Whoisprotection.cc, 韩思宇 (Siyu Han), Furst Sebastian
Case No. D2026-2538

1. The Parties

The Complainant is LOOP B.V., Belgium, represented by Novagraaf Belgium NV/SA, Belgium.

The Respondents are Daniels Finley, Finley Daniels, Germany, 黄保传 (bao chuan huang), China, 徐景波 (Xu Jingbo), China, 徐红梅, China, 徐辉, China, 吴鹂 (wu yi), China, Domain Admin, Whoisprotection.cc, Malaysia, 韩思宇 (Siyu Han), China and Furst Sebastian, Germany.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain name <loopearplugphilippines.com> is registered with CNOBIN Information Technology Limited. The disputed domain name <dreamkorvatulpat.com> is registered with Xiamen 35.Com Information Co., Ltd. The disputed domain name <loop-earplugs-greece.com> is registered with Kenpai International Technology Limited. The disputed domain names <loopearplugsmx.com>, <loopearplugnederland.com>, <loopearplugsegyp.com>, and <loopearplugschweiz.com> are registered with Vantage of Convergence (Chengdu) Technology Co., Ltd. The disputed domain names <loop-earplugsdanmark.com>, <loopearplugs-suomi.com>, <earplugsmexico.com> and <loopearplugshireland.com> are registered with Xin Net Technology Corporation. The disputed domain names <loopearplugsendonesia-id.com>, <loopearplugsendouthafrica.com>, and <loopearplugsenderland.com> are registered with Dominet (HK) Limited. The disputed domain names <loop-earplugsespana.com>, <loopearplugsmalaysiastore.com>, and <loop-earplugsthailand.com> are registered with Bangning Digital Technology Co., Ltd. The disputed domain names <loop-earplugsmx.com>, and <loop-earplugsgentina.com> are registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (collectively the “Registrar(s)”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 11, 2026. On June 11, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. Respectively on June 12, 2026, June 15, 2026 and June 16, 2026, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed

from the named Respondent (Anonymous) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 16, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints for the disputed 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 amended Complaint in English on June 18, 2026.

On June 16, 2026, the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain names <loop-earplugsdanmark.com>, <loopearplugs- suomi.com>, <loopearplugsireland.com>, <earplugs_mexico.com>, <dreamkorvatulpat.com>, <loop-earplugs-greece.com>, <loopearplugsmx.com>, <loopearplugschweiz.com>, <loopearplugsegypt.com>, and <loopearplugnederland.com> is Chinese. On June 18, 2026, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondents did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission.

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 Respondents in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceeding commenced on June 25, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 15, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Sebastian M.W. Hughes as the sole panelist in this matter on July 24, 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

A. Complainant

The Complainant is a Belgian life sciences company founded in 2016 and particularly known for its line of premium earplugs marketed under the trade marks LOOP and LOOP EARPLUGS (the "Trade Mark(s)"), and distributed in more than 150 countries worldwide.

The Complainant operates its principal website at "www.loopearplugs.com"; and, in addition, is the owner of several domain names comprising the Trade Marks.

The Complainant is the owner of registrations in jurisdictions worldwide for the LOOP Trade Mark, including European Union Trade Mark registration No. 015088693, with a registration date of May 24, 2016; International registration No. 1626467, with a registration date of October 4, 2021; as well as registration No. 35196532 in China for the LOOPEARPLUGS Trade Mark, with registration date of August 7, 2019.

B. Respondents

The Respondents are reportedly entities located in Germany, China, and Malaysia.

C. The Disputed Domain Names

The disputed domain names were registered on the following dates:

1. <loopearplugsindonesia-id.com> was registered on November 8, 2025;
2. <loopearplugs-southafrica.com> was registered on October 15, 2025;
3. <loopearplugs-nederland.com> was registered on October 13, 2025;
4. <loopearplugsphilippines.com> was registered on September 26, 2025;
5. <loopearplugsmx.com> was registered on November 6, 2025;
6. <loopearplugschweiz.com> was registered on December 9, 2025;
7. <loopearplugsegypt.com> was registered on November 26, 2025;
8. <loopearplugnederland.com> was registered on October 30, 2025;
9. <dreamkorvatulpat.com> was registered on February 10, 2026;
10. <loop-earplugsdanmark.com> was registered on October 16, 2025;
11. <loopearplugs-suomi.com> was registered on September 22, 2025;
12. <loopearplugsireland.com> was registered on August 15, 2025;
13. <loop-earplugsespana.com> was registered on December 30, 2025;
14. <loop-earplugsthailand.com> was registered on December 26, 2025;
15. <loopearplugsmalaysiastore.com> was registered on December 26, 2025;
16. <earplugs_mexico.com> was registered on February 25, 2026;
17. <loop-earplugs-greece.com> was registered on November 10, 2025;
18. <loop-earplugsargentina.com> was registered on November 10, 2025; and
19. <loop-earplugsmx.com> was registered on February 5, 2026

D. Use of the Disputed Domain Names

The majority of the disputed domain names have been used in respect of identical or similar websites with predominantly English language content and which (1) prominently feature the Complainant's Trade Marks; (2) reproduce the Complainant's product photographs, contact details, marketing materials and overall visual identity; (3) purportedly offer the Complainant's earplugs at discounted prices; (4) contain copyright notices comprising the Trade Marks; and (5) invite Internet users to enter their personal contact details (the "Websites").

The disputed domain name <loopearplugnederland.com>, <loop-earplugsargentina.com>, <loop-earplugsdanmark.com>, and <loop-earplugs-greece.com> have not been resolved to any active website.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names have been registered and used in bad faith in connection with the Websites.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issues

A. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

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 common control, the Panel notes that the majority of the disputed domain names exhibit the same highly distinctive and consistent domain name composition pattern; the disputed domain names were registered within a relatively short period of time, with several of the registrations occurring on the same date or within days of one another; and the disputed domain names have been used in the same manner in respect of identical or similar Websites.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

B. Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the majority of the disputed domain name is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact the disputed domain names consist of English language terms; and the Websites are predominantly in English.

The Respondent did not make any specific submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2 Substantive Issues

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of trade marks or service marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the Trade Marks are recognizable within each of the disputed domain names, with the exception of the disputed domain names <dreamkorvatulpat.com>, and <earplugs_mexico.com>. Accordingly, each of the disputed domain names, with the exception of the disputed domain names <dreamkorvatulpat.com>, and <earplugs_mexico.com>, is confusingly similar to the Trade Marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (either country names or acronyms representing country names) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names 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 in respect of each of the disputed domain names, with the exception of the disputed domain names <dreamkorvatulpat.com>, and <earplugs_mexico.com>.

In respect of the disputed domain name <dreamkorvatulpat.com>, the Complainant contends that the word "korvatulpat" means "earplugs" in the Finnish language, such that the disputed domain name may be translated as "dream earplugs". The Panel notes that this disputed domain name does not contain the Complainant's LOOP Trade Mark. The Panel considers further that the main distinguishing feature of the Complainant's LOOP EARPLUGS Trade Mark is the word "Loop". The disputed domain name <dreamkorvatulpat.com> contains a Finnish translation of the non-distinctive element of the LOOP EARPLUGS Trade Mark, namely, the word "earplugs", together with the dictionary word "dream". In all the circumstances, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name <dreamkorvatulpat.com> is not confusingly similar to either of the Complainant's Trade Marks.

The disputed domain name <earplugs_mexico.com> contains the non-distinctive element of the LOOP EARPLUGS Trade Mark, namely, the word "earplugs", together with the word "mexico". In all the circumstances, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name <earplugs_mexico.com> is not confusingly similar to either of the Complainant's Trade Marks.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has not been established with respect to the disputed domain names <dreamkorvatulpat.com> and <earplugs_mexico.com>.

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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed as applicable to this case: copycat sites, passing off, or other types of fraud) 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for activity (here, claimed as applicable to this case: copycat sites, passing off, or other types of fraud) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The non-use of the disputed domain names <loopearplugnederland.com>, <loop-earplugsargentina.com>, <loop-earplugsdanmark.com>, and <loop-earplugs-greece.com> does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the circumstances of this case.

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 names <loopearplugnederland.com>, <loop-earplugsargentina.com>, <loopearplugschweiz.com>, <loop-earplugsdanmark.com>, <loopearplugsegypt.com>, <loop-earplugsespana.com>, <loop-earplugs-greece.com>, <loopearplugsindonesia-id.com>, <loopearplugsireland.com>, <loopearplugsmalaysiastore.com>, <loop-earplugsmx.com>, <loopearplugsmx.com>, <loopearplugs-nederland.com>, <loopearplugsphilippines.com>, <loopearplugs-southafrica.com>, <loopearplugs-suomi.com>, and <loop-earplugsthailand.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

For the foregoing reasons, the Complaint is denied with respect to the disputed domain names <dreamkorvatulpat.com>, and <earplugsmexico.com>.

/Sebastian M.W. Hughes/

Sebastian M.W. Hughes

Sole Panelist

Date: August 7, 2026