

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Edgewell Personal Care Brands, LLC v. userdc dger  
Case No. D2025-3933

### 1. The Parties

Complainant is Edgewell Personal Care Brands, LLC, United States of America ("U.S."), internally represented.

Respondent is userdc dger, U.S.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <schickonline.shop> (the "Domain Name") is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrar").

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 26, 2025. On September 29, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. That same day, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (Withheld for Privacy Purposes, a privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on October 1, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on October 4, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on October 9, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 29, 2025. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent's default on October 31, 2025.

The Center appointed Harrie R. Samaras as the sole panelist in this matter on November 7, 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**

Complainant sells internationally personal care products, including razors and razor blades, under the SCHICK Mark. It owns numerous trademark registrations around the world for the SCHICK Mark (or the "Mark"), including: U.S. Registration Nos. 788,722 (registered April 27, 1965); and 2,881,805 (registered September 7, 2004).

Complainant actively promotes its goods (e.g., razors and razor blades) in connection with the SCHICK Mark including on its website, located at the domain name <schick.com>.

The Domain Name was registered on July 22, 2025. It is being used in conjunction with a live website (the "Website") prominently displaying the SCHICK Mark and selling what appears to be Complainant's shaving products in Complainant's packaging that further displays the Mark. Like Complainant's website, the Website is broken down into the same areas (i.e., home, women's products, men's products).

#### **5. Parties' Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the Domain Name. Notably, Complainant contends the following:

The Domain Name incorporates the SCHICK Mark in its entirety in the Domain Name merely adding the highly descriptive, if not generic, word "online" to it. The virtually identical Domain Name is confusingly similar to Complainant's well-known SCHICK Mark. Also, the Domain Name causes confusion and attempts to misdirect Internet users seeking Complainant's legitimate website to the Website where Complainant's products are also being "offered" for sale.

Respondent is not a licensee of Complainant and has never been affiliated with, connected to, or sponsored by Complainant. The SCHICK Mark was first registered in the U.S. in 1962 and it has been used continuously since then. Thus, Respondent was inevitably aware of the Mark when registering the Domain Name and, thus, it cannot have any rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Respondent has not applied to register or obtained trademark registrations for marks incorporating the SCHICK Mark. The only evident purpose for using the Domain Name is to deceitfully draw Internet users, who are interested in Complainant's products, to the Website. Similarly, Respondent cannot present any evidence to show it has been commonly known by the Domain Name. The Website is for commercial use, thus, Respondent cannot claim to have a noncommercial or fair use purpose. The lack of fair use is further supported in that "schick" is not a dictionary term which others can freely appropriate nor is it being used for a descriptive or expressive purpose, but instead to take advantage and trade off of Complainant's rights and reputation in the SCHICK Mark. Likewise, the Domain Name is neither part of a communicative message nor does it involve any genuine criticism of Complainant's business.

Given the fame of the SCHICK Mark in the razor and shaving industry, it is inconceivable that Respondent registered the Domain Name in good faith and without knowledge of Complainant's exclusive rights in the Mark. Moreover, as the SCHICK Mark registrations were a matter of public record when the Domain Name was registered, it is even more likely that Respondent had knowledge of Complainant's rights in the Mark. Complainant's rights to the SCHICK Mark would have been clearly evident to Respondent had it conducted a trademark search, or even a simple search engine query before registering the Domain Name.

Respondent's use of the Domain Name here could trigger Complainant's prospective customers being diverted to Respondent. Additionally, there is no doubt that the use of an established mark with descriptive wording is typosquatting and, thus, a bad faith use of the Domain Name. Respondent's sole motive appears to be to improperly profit from the goodwill and fame that Complainant has achieved in its SCHICK Mark.

## **B. Respondent**

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

## **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 a 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.

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 Mark is reproduced within the Domain Name. Accordingly, the 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 other terms here, "online" 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 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 a 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 available record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a *prima facie* case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name. Respondent has not rebutted Complainant's *prima facie* showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

It is undisputed that Respondent: (1) is not a licensee of Complainant and has never been affiliated with, connected to, or sponsored by Complainant; (2) does not have any rights in the Domain Name; and (3) has not been known by the Domain Name. The only evident purpose for using the Domain Name is to draw Internet users, who are interested in Complainant's products, to the Website for commercial gain.

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: (1) Respondent registered the confusingly similar Domain Name at least 60 years after Complainant began using the Mark; (2) Complainant has been using the Mark internationally in conjunction with the sale of razors and razor blades, among other things; (3) Respondent is using the Domain Name in conjunction with the Website which sells products that look like Complainant's razor and razor blade products; and (4) the Domain Name is similar to Complainant's domain name. Thus, the Panel concludes that Respondent knew of Complainant and Complainant's rights in the Mark when registering the Domain Name.

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.

Respondent is using the Mark to sell razor products that compete with those same products Complainant sells on its website under the Mark. Not only is Respondent doing this using a confusingly similar domain name, the Domain Name is also similar to Complainant's domain name <schick.com> except for the term "online," which could suggest to the public that the Website is Complainant's online presence. In using the Domain Name in conjunction with the Website, Respondent is intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the SCHICK Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

The Panel finds that 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 Domain Name <schickonline.shop> be transferred to Complainant.

/Harrie R. Samaras/  
**Harrie R. Samaras**  
Sole Panelist  
Date: November 17, 2025