

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

iFamilySC Co., Ltd. v. Jong Seo Hwang, romandglobal_en
Case No. D2025-2324

1. The Parties

The Complainant is iFamilySC Co., Ltd., Republic of Korea, represented by Marq Vision Inc., United States of America.

The Respondent is Jong Seo Hwang, romandglobal_en, Republic of Korea.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <romandglobal-en.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 13, 2025. On June 13, 2025, the Center transmitted to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 13, 2025, the Registrar transmitted to the Center its verification response disclosing the registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name, which differed from the named Respondent (Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0166023788) and contact information in the Complaint. On June 18, 2025, the Center provided the Complainant with the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar and invited the Complainant to amend the Complaint. On June 19, 2025, the Complainant responded to the Center: "We would like to include the registrant's information in the complaint submitted for this case."

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 proceeding commenced on June 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for the Response was July 13, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 22, 2025.

The Center appointed Professor Ilhyung Lee as the sole panelist in this matter on August 4, 2025. 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 describes itself as “a prominent entity in the global skincare and cosmetics industry, best known for its flagship brand, ‘Rom&nd’.” The Complainant has provided trademark registrations of ROMAND in the Republic of Korea (registration number 4,500,732,800,000, registered on April 26, 2017) and China (registration number 23,082,271 registered on May 14, 2018). The Complainant also registered the domain name <romand.co.kr> on March 3, 2016, which leads to an official website with some Korean text and featuring the Complainant’s various cosmetics products.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 23, 2022. At the time of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website displaying cosmetics products, with English text, including “rom&ndglobal” appearing at the top.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends principally that: (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a mark in which the Complainant has rights; (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. In addition, the Complaint states, inter alia:

“[T]here is no relationship or affiliation between the Complainant and the Respondent that would give rise to any license, permission, or other right under which the Respondent could own or use any domain name incorporating the Complainant’s ROMAND marks”

“[I]t is evident that at the time of registration, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its trademarks.”

“The website [from which the disputed domain name resolves] offers what appear to be genuine products that are identical or similar to those of the Complainant, but it unlawfully uses product photographs -- including modified versions of official images taken from the Complainant’s website”

“[T]he Respondent’s use of a privacy shield to withhold all identifying information from the domain’s Whois record further supports a finding of bad faith.”

“On May 30, 2025, the disputed domain name was reported in detail to the relevant Registrar for Intellectual Property Infringement. Despite the report and follow-up emails prompted by the Respondent’s unresponsiveness, the Respondent has failed to reply or comply with the Complainant’s request to transfer the disputed domain name”

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions. Under paragraphs 5(f) and 14(a) of the Rules, the Panel may decide the dispute based on the Complaint. Paragraph 14(b) allows the Panel to draw appropriate inferences from the Respondent’s default.

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 disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Complainant's ROMAND mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of "global-en" may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Panel finds that the addition of such a term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com", a technical registration requirement, is disregarded in the consideration of this element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds that the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

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 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 of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Here, the Complainant states that it has not authorized the Respondent to use the ROMAND mark and has met its initial burden of making a prima facie showing that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. Thus, the burden shifts to the Respondent to demonstrate any such rights or legitimate interests. Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

The Respondent has defaulted. It 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. The Panel is unable to ascertain any evidence that would demonstrate the Respondent's rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds that the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Under paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, the Complainant must show that the disputed domain name “has been registered and is being used in bad faith”. Paragraph 4(b) provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances that provide “evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.”

Here, Internet users who visited the disputed domain name were taken to a website that displayed the Complainant’s trademark and cosmetics products similar to those seen in the Complainant’s official website. In the Panel’s view, the overall content of the two websites were quite similar, except for the English and Korean text.

Under these circumstances, the Panel concludes that “by using the [disputed] domain name, [the Respondent] intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the Respondent’s] web site ..., by creating a likelihood of confusion with the [C]omplainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the Respondent’s] web site ... or of a product or service on [the Respondent’s] web site,” under paragraph 4(b)(iv).

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 <romandglobal-en.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ilhyung Lee/

Ilhyung Lee

Sole Panelist

Date: August 18, 2025