

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Ilia Inc. v. Yan Wenming  
Case No. D2025-5353

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is Ilia Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Sideman & Bancroft LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Yan Wenming, China.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <iliabeautys.com> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the “Registrar”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 20, 2025. On December 22, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 23, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 proceedings commenced on December 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 19, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Torsten Bettinger as the sole panelist in this matter on January 23, 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, based in California, United States, manufactures and markets cosmetics products under the ILIA brand. It is the proprietor of several trademarks, including the following:

- United States Trademark Reg. No. 4098691 for ILIA (word mark), registered on February 14, 2012 for goods and services in classes 3 and 35; and
- United States Trademark Reg. No. 5857861 for ILIA (word mark), registered on September 10, 2019 for services in class 44.

The Complainant owns and operates its official website at the domain name <iliabeauty.com>, which it also uses as its primary online retail platform.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 8, 2025.

At the time of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to an active website that closely replicates the Complainant's official website, including e-commerce pages displaying the Complainant's trademark ILIA, product images, and marketing materials, as well as corresponding pages for discounts, newsletters, order tracking, and "About Us" page.

#### 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 since its founding in 2011, it has grown into a leading name in the "clean beauty" movement, offering high-performance cosmetics and skincare products formulated with safe, effective ingredients.

With regard to the requirement of identity or confusing similarity between the trademark and the domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Complainant contends that

- the disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's distinctive ILIA mark and is nearly identical to the Complainant's domain name <iliabeauty.com>, differing only by the addition of the letter "s"; and
- the mark ILIA remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name, and the minor addition does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

With regard to the Respondent having no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, the Complainant submitted that

- there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or by ILIA or "ILIA BEAUTY", nor is there any relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent, or authorization, or license from the Complainant;
- the Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor for any legitimate noncommercial or fair use; instead, the disputed domain name has been used to impersonate the Complainant through a website closely replicating the Complainant's official website, including use of the Complainant's trademark and content, for deceptive purposes; such use cannot confer rights or legitimate interests under the Policy; and

– in the absence of any evidence from the Respondent rebutting the Complainant’s prima facie case, the Complainant should be deemed to have satisfied the second element.

Finally, with regard to the disputed domain name having been registered and being used in bad faith, the Complainant argues that

- the disputed domain name was registered in December 2025, many years after the Complainant had established rights in the well-known ILIA mark;
- the disputed domain name has been used to impersonate the Complainant through a website closely replicating the Complainant’s official website, including use of the Complainant’s trademarks, product images, and content, in order to mislead Internet users for commercial gain; and
- use of a domain name for impersonation, passing off, or other deceptive or fraudulent activity constitutes evidence of bad faith registration and use under the Policy.

## **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy states that the Complainant must prove each of the three following elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and
- (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.

### **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.

In the present case, the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant’s trademark in its entirety, adding the term “beautys”. The applicable generic Top-Level Domain is disregarded for the purpose of the analysis. The addition of this term does not prevent the Complainant’s mark from being clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

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.

In particular, there is no evidence that the Respondent has been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted by the Complainant to use the ILIA trademark, nor is there any relationship between the Parties.

There is also no evidence on record that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or by ILIA or "ILIA BEAUTY", whether as a personal name, business name, or other identifier.

Finally, the Respondent has also failed to demonstrate any use of the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, or any legitimate noncommercial or fair use under paragraph 4(c)(iii). Instead, the disputed domain name has been used to impersonate the Complainant through a website closely replicating the Complainant's official website, including use of the Complainant's trademark, product images, and website content, thereby creating a false impression that it is operated or endorsed by the Complainant.

Panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for impersonation, passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. Such use is inherently illegitimate and incompatible with any claim of bona fide or fair use under the Policy.

In the absence of any evidence from the Respondent rebutting the Complainant's prima facie case, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

### **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.

#### **(i) Bad Faith Registration**

The disputed domain name was registered in December 2025, long after the Complainant had established rights in the ILIA trademark, which is distinctive and well known in connection with the Complainant's products. Given the timing of the registration, the absence of any explanation for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name and the manner in which it has been used, the Panel concludes that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark rights at the time of registration.

#### **(ii) Bad Faith Use**

The Respondent has used the disputed domain name to operate a website that closely replicates the Complainant's official website, including use of the Complainant's trademark, product images, "About Us" page, including the company history, and marketing materials, thereby presenting itself as an official or authorized online presence of the Complainant. Such conduct demonstrates intentional impersonation and an effort to mislead Internet users for commercial gain.

Panels have consistently held that the registration and use of a domain name for impersonation, passing off constitutes clear evidence of bad faith under the Policy ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4). In light of the Panel's finding of the Respondent's knowledge of the Complainant's rights at the time of registration, and the

misleading use of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

## **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 <iliabeautys.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Torsten Bettinger/*

**Torsten Bettinger**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 6, 2026