

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Huda Beauty Limited v. Huang Shimei, Huang Shimei
Case No. D2025-5289

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Huang Shimei, Huang Shimei, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <hudabeautymalls.com> is registered with Key-Systems GmbH (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 18, 2025. On December 18, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 19, 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 December 30, 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 December 31, 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 January 6, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 26, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 27, 2026.

The Center appointed Christiane Féral-Schuhl as the sole panelist in this matter on January 29, 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

The Complainant was founded in 2013 by Huda Kattan, a beauty entrepreneur and influencer.

Originating from a beauty blog launched in 2010, the Complainant has since become a major player in the cosmetics industry. The brand enjoys a strong international presence, both online and through retail distribution, offering a wide range of beauty products across numerous countries.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademarks for HUDABEAUTY (the “HUDABEAUTY Trademarks”), including the following:

- The European Union figurative trademark HUDABEAUTY, No. 015755549, registered on December 19, 2016, for goods and services in classes 3, 9, 35, 41 and 44;
- The United States of America figurative trademark HUDABEAUTY, No. 5459220, registered on May 1st, 2018, for goods and services in classes 3 and 35;
- The China Hong Kong figurative trademark HUDABEAUTY, No. 306520086, registered on April 8, 2024, for goods and services in classes 3, 9, 16, 18, 21, 25, 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 by the Respondent on August 4, 2025, and resolves to a commercial website offering various products including clothes and accessories.

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 is confusingly similar to its HUDABEAUTY Trademarks, as it incorporates the HUDABEAUTY Trademarks in its entirety, together with the term “malls”, which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has no right or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name. In particular, the Complainant has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its HUDABEAUTY Trademarks, nor to register or use a domain name incorporating the trademarks. The Complainant asserts that there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name terms and emphasizes that no relationship of any kind exists between the Parties. Moreover, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has not made any bona fide use of the disputed domain name and has no demonstrable preparation to do so.

Finally, the Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The HUDABEAUTY Trademarks were registered well before the registration of the disputed domain name, and the Respondent could not reasonably have been unaware of the Complainant's prior rights at the time of registration. The Complainant further submits that the disputed domain name resolves to a website purporting to offer various products, including clothing and accessories. Such use is likely to mislead

Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name and the associated website are owned by, endorsed by, or affiliated with the Complainant, particularly given the Complainant's established presence and reputation in the fields of beauty, fashion, and related accessories.

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 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 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 another term here, "malls" 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 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.

Indeed, it appears that the Complainant has not licensed or authorized the Respondent to use the Complainant's trademarks and did not authorize the Respondent to register or use the disputed domain name incorporating its trademarks. Moreover, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Panel also notes the composition of the disputed domain name, which reproduces the HUDABEAUTY Trademarks in its entirety together with the term “malls”. Such composition may falsely suggest to Internet users that the disputed domain name refers to an official online mall or marketplace for the Complainant's products and therefore carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant.

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 well after the registration and widespread use of the Complainant's HUDABEAUTY Trademarks. Given the distinctiveness and reputation of the HUDABEAUTY Trademarks and the strong online visibility of the Complainant, together with the composition of the disputed domain name, which reproduces the trademark in its entirety combined with the term “malls”, the Panel considers it highly unlikely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant and its trademarks. On the contrary, the Panel finds that the Respondent was more likely seeking to target the Complainant's mark and to create an association with the Complainant in the minds of Internet users. The Panel therefore finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain names carries a risk of implied affiliation, in a likely attempt of taking unfair advantage of the identity of the Complainant's HUDABEAUTY Trademarks and 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 <hudabeautymalls.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Christiane Féral-Schuhl/

Christiane Féral-Schuhl

Sole Panelist

Date: February 3, 2026