

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Edgewell Personal Care Brands, LLC v. theouya theouya  
Case No. D2026-0612

### **1. The Parties**

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

The Respondent is theouya theouya, China.

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

The disputed domain name <skintimatestore.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 13, 2026. On February 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 18, 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 (Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 18, 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 February 22, 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 February 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 15, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 17, 2026.

The Center appointed Theda König Horowicz as the sole panelist in this matter on April 2, 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 is a U.S. based company that sells internationally personal care products, including razors and razor blades, under the SKINTIMATE trademark among others.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for the SKINTIMATE trademark including U.S. trademark registration for Registration No 2,058,439 of April 29, 1997, for use with “shave foam; shave cream; shaving preparations” in Class 3.

The Complainant actively promotes its goods (e.g., razors and razor blades) in connection with the SKINTIMATE trademark, notably on its official website at “www.schick.com” which is accessible worldwide.

The disputed domain name was registered on October 29, 2025. It is being used in conjunction with a commercial website purportedly promoting goods under the SKINTIMATE brand.

The website contains an “About us” section which states the following:

##### **“Skincare Innovation**

Skintimate has established itself as a trusted name in personal care, offering a comprehensive range of shaving solutions designed specifically to enhance your shaving experience. Our brand philosophy centers on providing products that prioritize skin health while delivering exceptional results.

##### **Product Excellence**

Our lineup includes the popular Skintimate shave gel and shaving cream formulations that help protect your skin while ensuring a close, comfortable shave. We’ve expanded our offerings to include specialized razors engineered for precision and comfort, refreshing ice rollers to soothe skin, and nourishing shave oils that provide superior glide and moisturization.

##### **Commitment to Care**

At Skintimate, we understand that shaving is more than just hair removal—it’s an important part of your self-care routine. That’s why each of our products is developed with careful attention to quality and performance, helping you achieve smooth, healthy skin with every use. We continue to innovate and expand our range to meet the evolving needs of our customers.”

#### **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 highly proximate and undoubtedly confusingly similar to the Complainant’s SKINTIMATE trademark. The disputed domain name simply recreates the well-known SKINTIMATE trademark in its entirety and sequence, merely adding the highly descriptive word “store” to the end of it.

Furthermore, the disputed domain name was registered without any legitimate interests or rights in it notably since the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant and has never been affiliated with, connected to, or sponsored by the Complainant. The SKINTIMATE trademark was first registered in the U.S. in 1995 and it has been used continuously since then. The Respondent can therefore not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not known under the SKINTIMATE trademark or name on which it has no exclusive rights. The website operated in connection with the disputed domain name is for commercial disruption, gain and diversion.

Finally, the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Indeed, given the fame of the SKINTIMATE trademark in the razor and shaving industry, it is inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without the knowledge of the Complainant's exclusive rights. The use of the disputed domain name on a website featuring shave gel, shave oils, shaving cream, razors which are famously also provided by the Complainant could trigger the Complainant's prospective customers being diverted to rival providers is a clear example of use in bad faith. The Respondent's sole motive appears to be to improperly profit from the goodwill and fame that the Complainant has achieved in its SKINTIMATE trademark.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable".

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires that the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that the disputed domain name should be cancelled or transferred:

- (i) the domain name registered by the Respondent 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 domain name; and
- (iii) the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

In view of the Respondent's failure to submit a Response, the Panel shall decide these administrative proceedings on the basis of the Complainant's undisputed representations pursuant to paragraphs 5(f), 14(a) and 15(a) of the Rules and draw such inferences as it considers appropriate pursuant to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules. The Panel is entitled to accept all reasonable allegations set forth in a complaint. However, the Panel may deny relief where a complaint contains mere conclusory or unsubstantiated arguments. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.3.

### **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 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of the trademark SKINTIMATE for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the mark is entirely contained and clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. Although the addition of other terms - here at the end of the disputed domain name the term “store” - 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 3.1](#), 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 that 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 3.1](#), 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.

The Panel notes that the disputed domain name entirely reproduces the Complainant’s distinctive trademark. The Complainant has shown to have used this trademark during many years in the U.S. and on its official website which is accessible worldwide. It is apparent that the Complainant’s trademark acquired a notoriety in relation to personal care products.

Furthermore, the Complainant provided evidence showing that the disputed domain name is linked to a website prominently using the SKINTIMATE trademark and offering SKINTIMATE goods for sale without the Complainant’s authorization.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed as applicable to this case passing off can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 observes that the Respondent was obviously aware of the Complainant’s trademark SKINTIMATE when registering the disputed domain name which has been widely used, notably on the Internet, for about 20 years by the Complainant. A simple search on the Internet shows indeed that SKINTIMATE is owned and used by the Complainant. Additionally, it would have been easy for the Respondent to check whether SKINTIMATE is a registered trademark online.

The composition of the disputed domain name which contains not only the SKINTIMATE trademark but also the word “store”, as well as the content of the website, demonstrate that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used for commercial purpose.

The case file indeed shows that the disputed domain name is linked to a website prominently using the SKINTIMATE trademark for personal care products without the Complainant’s authorization. These goods are offered for sale in a way that creates a strong likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s trademark and business, for commercial gain. In particular, the website contains an “About us” section which wrongly gives the impression to Internet users of a connection between the Respondent’s commercial website at the disputed domain name and the Complainant.

In the absence of any contrary information by the Respondent who chose to remain silent in the present proceedings and based on the circumstances of the present case, the Panel concludes that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 <skintimatestore.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Theda König Horowicz/*

**Theda König Horowicz**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 24, 2026