ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Huda Beauty Limited v. kiarae eqwe, firezheholemediaw
Case No. D2025-3599

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Huda Beauty Limited, British Virgin Islands, United Kingdom, represented by Rouse Consultancy (Shanghai) Ltd., China.

The Respondent is kiarae eqwe, firezheholemediaw, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Disputed Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <hudabeautydeals.com> (the "Disputed Domain Name") is 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 September 5, 2025. On September 5, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On September 8, 2025, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 16, 2025, 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 amended Complaint on September 17, 2025.

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on September 22, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 12, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any formal response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 13, 2025. After the due date for Response, two email communications were received on October 18 and 22, 2025, by the Center from an email address displayed on the website at the disputed domain name.

The Center appointed Marilena Comanescu as the sole panelist in this matter on October 17, 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 was founded in 2013 by the award-winning beauty blogger Huda Kattan, who received numerous recognitions and accolades in her industry, including being listed by Forbes in The Top Beauty Influencers 2017, The Middle East's 100 Most Powerful Businesswomen 2024, and The America's Richest Self-Made women 2023.

Beginning as a blog in 2010, the Complainant is one of the world's fast-growing beauty brands and leading beauty influencer in the world with over 57 million Instagram followers, 7.7. million Facebook followers, and 4.17 million YouTube followers. Currently, the Complainant sells more than100 products in over 50 countries, in more than 1,200 retail stores, and has been named as the most popular beauty brand for the first quarter of the year 2025 by Cosmetics Business[1] ranking.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations globally for the mark HUDABEAUTY, including but not limited to the following:

- the United States Trademark Registration number 5459220 for HUDABEAUTY (figurative), filed on September 29, 2016, registered on May 1, 2018, covering goods and services in International Classes 3, and 35; and

- the European Union trademark registration number 015755549 for HUDABEAUTY (figurative), filed on August 18, 2016, registered on December 19, 2016, covering goods and services in International Classes 3, 9, 35, 41, and 44.

The Complainant conducts its online business under the domain name <hudabeauty.com>, registered on April 3, 2010.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on July 31, 2025, and, at the time of filing of the Complaint it resolved to a commercial website offering for sale clothing products. Also, the website under the Disputed Domain Name was displaying the pink color, a shade that is similar to the color the Complainan't uses on its official website, without providing any disclaimer.

The Respondent is also involved in another pending UDRP dispute filed by the Complainant, and has been involved in at least one previous UDRP dispute decided against it[2]. See *Huda Beauty Limited v. kiarae eqwe, firezheholemediaw,* WIPO case No. D2025-3600, and *Retail World FZE v. kiarae eqwe, firezheholemediaw*, WIPO Case No. D2025-3486.

[1] Cosmetics Business is a United Kingdom based publishing company that reports on the industry, see website at "www.cosmeticsbusiness.com".

[2] See Panel's general power to conduct limited searches, WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("WIPO Overview 3.0"), section 4.8.

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 it established significant and broad reputation in the mark HUDABEAUTY through continuous investment, operation and advertising; the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to its earlier trademark, because it incorporates the HUDABEAUTY mark in its entirety together with the term "deals"; the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name and the use of the Disputed Domain Name by the Respondent, resolving to a website, purportedly offering clothes (products closely connected with the beauty products offered by the Complainant), and displaying the same pink color as the Complainant uses on its website, cannot be considered as a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name; the Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith, as evidenced mainly by the following: the widespread reputation, recognition and significant distinctiveness of the HUDABEAUTY mark through continuous and extensive use in connection with cosmetic products and services worldwide; the Complainant's trademark registered since 2016 which predates the registration of the Disputed Domain Name registered in 2025; a simple search via Google or any other search engine would have revealed the Complainant's exclusive connection with "hudabeauty" and "hudabeautydeals" keywords; given the reputation of the Complainant and its mark, the Disputed Domain Name itself would inevitably attract Internet users ad consumers who are looking for the Complainant's products to visit the website under the Disputed Domain Name, and, in addition, the use of the same pink color as the Complainant's own color on its official website would further strengthen a misleading impression of affiliation with the Complainant and this indicates that the Respondent has intentions to create confusion with the Complainant, and that the Respondent has intentionally diverted Internet users to the website under the Disputed Domain Name for commercial gain, which is opportunistically and bad faith; in addition, the Complainant found another domain name <hudabeautyclearance.com>, registered in August 2025 and which redirects to the website at the Disputed Domain Name, being likely held by the same entity, and thus resulting that the Respondent is targeting the Complainant's HUDABEAUTY trademark to register domain names and intentionally attempt to use the domain names to attract Internet users or consumers to visit its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its HUDABEAUTY trademark.

B. Respondent

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

The Respondent's two email communications were received from the email address displayed at the website at the Disputed Domain Name and merely acknowledged the safe receipt of the message, without addressing the present proceedings, and informed that the Respondent cannot provide specific details regarding the case. Further, the email read "If you have any questions about your order or need assistance with a different matter, please share the order number [..]".

6. Discussion and Findings

Under the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove on the balance of probabilities that:

(i) the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name; and

(iii) the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 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 Panel finds the mark HUDABEAUTY is recognizable 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.

While the addition of other term, here "deals", 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 3.0, 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 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 3.0, 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 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.

The Panel notes that the composition of the Disputed Domain Name, which incorporates the Complainant's well-known trademark with the term "deals" which could suggest a connection to the Complainants' sale efforts, as well as the use of the same color as the Complainant on the website under the Disputed Domain Name, on balance, affirm the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the website at the dispute domain name.

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 Disputed Domain Name was registered in bad faith, with knowledge of the Complainant and its trademark particularly because the Complainant's trademark predates the registration of the Disputed Domain Name by almost nine years, has acquired international reputation in its industry and the composition of the Disputed Domain Name itself, comprising the HUDABEAUTY trademark, followed by a dictionary term, "deals", which might be interpreted as associated with the Complainant's commercial activity.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.2.1.

At the time of filing of the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to a commercial website to promote clothing products.

Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy provides that the use of a domain name to intentionally attempt "to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to [the respondent's] website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of [the respondent's] web site or location or of a product or service on [the respondent's] web site or location" is evidence of registration and use in bad faith.

Given that the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's well-known trademark, and the website operated under the Disputed Domain Name displays a box in the pink color in the same manner as used by the Complainant on its official website and has no disclaimer, indeed in this Panel's view, the Respondent has intended to attract Internet users accessing the website corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name under a mistaken belief that such website is held, controlled by, or somehow affiliated with or related to the Complainant, for the Respondent's commercial gain.

Previous UDRP panels have found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a widely known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can, by itself, create a presumption of bad faith for the purpose of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.0., section 3.1.4.

Paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy provides another circumstance of bad faith registration and use when the respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct. UDRP panels have held that establishing a pattern of bad faith conduct requires more than one, but as few as two instances of abusive domain name registration. The Respondent's involvement in at least one other domain name UDRP dispute, supports this sch finding. WIPO Overview 3.0, section 3.1.2.

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, <hudabeautydeals.com>, be transferred to the Complainant.

/Marilena Comanescu/
Marilena Comanescu
Sole Panelist
Date: October 31 , 2025