

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Huda Beauty Limited v. sgtrfsegwreg dfgvdgtdfhgd  
Case No. D2025-5418

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is sgtrfsegwreg dfgvdgtdfhgd, Andorra.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <hudabeautyeu.shop> is registered with West263 International Limited (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on December 31, 2025. On January 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 4, 2026, 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 January 5, 2026, 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 January 6, 2026.

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 Andrew F. Christie as the sole panelist in this matter on January 30, 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 award-winning beauty blogger Huda Kattan, who has been included on various lists of the most influential people in business, beauty, or the Middle East published by Forbes. The Complainant has over 57 million Instagram followers, 7.7 million Facebook followers, and 4.17 million YouTube followers. It sells more than 100 products in over 50 countries and more than 1,200 retail stores, offering an entire range of cosmetics, skincare, and fragrance.

The Complainant owns numerous registrations around the world for a stylized trademark consisting of the words HUDABEAUTY (“HUDABEAUTY trademark”), including Australian Trademark No. 1806380 (registered on November 1, 2016), European Union Trade Mark No. 015755549 (registered on December 19, 2016), and United States Registration No. 5,459,220 (registered on May 1, 2018).

The Complainant registered the domain name <hudabeauty.com> on April 3, 2010, and has been using it for its official website since then.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 4, 2025. The Complainant has provided screenshots of DomainTools records showing that, on November 4, 2025, the disputed domain name resolved to a website headed “hudabeauty”, at which the Complainant’s cosmetics products labelled with the Complainant’s HUDABEAUTY trademark were purportedly offered for sale. At the date on which the Complaint was filed, the disputed domain name did not resolve to an active location; this is also the case at the date of this decision.

#### **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.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which it has rights on the following grounds, among others. The Complainant possesses prior rights in the HUDABEAUTY trademark. The dominant component of the disputed domain name is “hudabeautyeu”, which incorporates the Complainant’s HUDABEAUTY trademark in its entirety and the geographical term “eu”. It is long-established in UDRP precedents that the mere addition of a geographical term such as “eu” does not prevent the disputed domain name from being confusingly similar to the Complainant’s HUDABEAUTY trademark.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name on the following grounds, among others. It is well established that mere registration does not create any rights or legitimate interests in a domain name. To the best knowledge of the Complainant, the Respondent does not have any trademark rights corresponding to the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The Complainant has never authorized or licensed the Respondent to use the HUDABEAUTY trademark in any manner, including registering domain names incorporating it. There is no evidence indicating that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name cannot be considered as a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, given that it was attempting to give the impression, which is false, that it is an official or authorized website of the Complainant.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith on the following grounds, among others. The Complainant obtained trademark registrations for the HUDABEAUTY trademark which predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name clearly indicates the Respondent's actual knowledge of the Complainant and its HUDABEAUTY trademark when registering and using the disputed domain name. The Respondent's previous use of the disputed domain name would give every appearance of being associated or affiliated with the Complainant. Such use of the disputed domain name creates a false impression of affiliation with the Complainant and disrupts the Complainant's business, which behavior is indicative of bad faith registration and use under the Policy. Clearly the Respondent was intentionally attempting to trade on the goodwill associated with HUDABEAUTY trademark in which the Complainant has rights and to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and the HUDABEAUTY trademark.

## **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. It is the owner of trademark registrations for a stylized trademark consisting of the term HUDABEAUTY.

The entirety of the word component of the Complainant's trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name, with the addition of the suffix "eu". The Panel finds the Complainant's trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, and that the addition of the suffix does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the trademark for the purposes of the Policy. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark for the purposes of the Policy.

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.

The Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, is not otherwise affiliated with the Complainant, and has not been authorized by the Complainant to use its HUDABEAUTY trademark. The Respondent has not provided any evidence that it has been commonly known by, or has made a bona fide use of, the disputed domain name, or that it has, for any other reason, rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant.

The Complainant provided evidence that the disputed domain name resolved to a website that reproduced the Complainant's HUDABEAUTY trademark and which purported to offer the Complainant's products under that trademark. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name in this way unfairly took advantage of the Complainant's trademark for the Respondent's benefit, and falsely suggested a connection or affiliation with the Complainant to purportedly offer the Complainant's products. Such use of the disputed domain name is not a bona fide offering of goods or services, and is not a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Accordingly, such use does not confer on the Respondent rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has put forward a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and the Respondent has not rebutted this. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

In the present case, the Panel notes that: (i) the Respondent registered the disputed domain name nearly a decade after the Complainant first registered its HUDABEAUTY trademark; (ii) the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, and merely adds the suffix "eu", which alludes to the geographic region of the European Union, a region in which the Complainant provides its products under its trademark; and (iii) the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to resolve to a web location at which the Complainant's trademark is used. It is clear the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant's trademark.

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. The evidence shows that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in an intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to a website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute 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 <hudabeauty.eu.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Andrew F. Christie/*

**Andrew F. Christie**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 13, 2026