

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Orveon Global Ltd. v. 王士飞

Case No. D2025-4734

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Orveon Global Ltd., United Kingdom, represented by Ladas & Parry, LLP, United States of America ("U.S.").

The Respondent is 王士飞, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lauramarcier.makeup> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on November 14, 2025. On November 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 18, 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, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 18, 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 amended Complaints on November 20 and 21, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaints 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 November 25, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 15, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 18, 2025.

The Center appointed Meera Chature Sankhari as the sole panelist in this matter on December 24, 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, Orveon Global Ltd., is a limited company based in United Kingdom. Orveon Global Ltd. acting as the lead entity and filer. Laura Mercier US Buyer, LLC is the Complainant's affiliate.

The Complainant is the owner and/or beneficial owner of the trademark LAURA MERCIER through itself and its affiliated entities. It holds a significant number of registrations in the LAURA MERCIER trademark worldwide (including China), offering high-end cosmetic related goods and services. The Complainant's U.S. affiliate, Laura Mercier US Buyer, LLC owns rights in the trademark LAURA MERCIER in the U.S. under Registration No. 2,350,939, dated May 16, 2000, in Classes 16 and 42, and Registration No. 2,750,756 dated August 12, 2003, in Classes 03 & 09. The Complainant also holds an international registration for the mark LAURA MERCIER under International Registration No. 1381417, dated May 9, 2019, in Classes 03 and 21.

The Complainant also owns hundreds of domain name registrations containing their LAURA MERCIER trademarks or similar marks, including <lauramercier.com> and <lauramarcier.com>.

The disputed domain name is registered on July 14, 2025. The disputed domain name, at the time of filing of the Complaint, resolved to a website with the header "LAURA MERCIER", purportedly offering cosmetic products labeled with the Complainant's trademark and apparently being sold at a deep discount.

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 wholly incorporates the Complainant's mark with the exception of one letter whereby the letter "a" is used instead of the letter "e". Such misspelling is just to gain website traffic based on a mere typographical error, also known as "typosquatting". Further, addition of ".makeup" as generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") serves the functional requirement and is not an arbitrary trademark choice. Thus, the disputed domain name is identical to and nearly identical to the Complainant's trademark and domain name registrations especially, <lauramarcier.com>.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name resolved to a page that blatantly imitated the Complainant's actual LAURA MERCIER website and allegedly selling cosmetics owned by the Complainant or counterfeit cosmetics bearing the Complainant's LAURA MERCIER mark. Such actions do not show any bona fide use nor does it confer any rights or legitimate interests in the Respondent.

The Complainant reiterates the unauthorised use of the Complainant's trademark in the disputed domain name and submits that it only indicates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its well-established LAURA MERCIER marks and is trying to obtain commercial gain from it. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent's use of the privacy shield in order to hide its identity and prevent the Complainant from contacting it amounts to bad faith. Lastly, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name wholly incorporates a nearly identical version of the Complainant's LAURA MERCIER mark, while adding a generic term "makeup", which is directly related to the Complainant's field of business i.e. cosmetics, including facial and body makeup. Thus, the action of the Respondent amounts to bad faith.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the 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 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 trademark LAURA MERCIER or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark 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. The Panel notes that mere misspelling of the Complainant's trademark LAURA MERCIER in the disputed domain name <lauramarcier.makeup> does not prevent the finding of confusing similarity and is nothing but an incident of typosquatting.

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 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed impersonation/passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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 disputed domain name resolves to a webpage purportedly offering to sell the Complainant's cosmetic products, thereby, causing consumer confusion and deception. This is further enhanced by the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name with a minor misspelling, which is no doubt calculated and intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed impersonation/passing off constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <lauramarcier.makeup> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Meera Chature Sankhari/

Meera Chature Sankhari

Sole Panelist

Date: January 7, 2026