ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

The Procter & Gamble Company, Braun GmbH v. Albert Smith, Zhichao
Case No. D2026-0919

1. The Parties

The Complainants are The Procter & Gamble Company (the first Complainant), United States of America ("US") and Braun GmbH (the second Complainant), US, represented by Studio Barbero S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondents are Albert Smith, China and Zhichao, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrars

The disputed domain names <braunb.com>, <braunm.com> and <brraun.com> are registered with Dynadot Inc. The disputed domain name <nraun.com> is registered with Spaceship, Inc. (Dynadot Inc and Spaceship, Inc. are collectively referred to as the "Registrars").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 3, 2026. On March 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrars requests for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On the same day, the Registrars transmitted by email to the Center their verification responses disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondents (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot and Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on March 5, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrars, requesting the Complainants to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint on March 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on March 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 30, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 4, 2026.

The Center appointed Mireille Buydens as the sole panelist in this matter on April 13, 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 first Complainant, founded in 1837 by William Procter and James Gamble, is one of the largest companies in the world and manufactures a wide range of consumer goods in diverse areas. It is present in about 70 countries with more than 5 billion consumers, and operates in the field of cleaning agents, personal care and hygienic products with over 65 brands, including BRAUN. The first Complainant is active in China since 1988 through a subsidiary, and is one of the largest consumer products companies in China, employing more than 8,000 people and serving over a billion Chinese consumers.

The second Complainant, founded back in 1921, is an internationally renowned brand for small electrical appliances, including notably shavers, hair care appliances, and female electric hair removal. To date, the second Complainant has received over 100 internationally recognized design prizes for its products and holds more than 8,000 active patents.

The Complainants operate within an extensive sales network consisting of more than 100,000 employees in over 180 countries and through their distribution channels BRAUN products are distributed worldwide, including in China. In the last years, the Complainants invested over USD 180 million to promote the BRAUN trademark, including online on the most popular social media platforms.

The second Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations covering the BRAUN trademark, including the following registrations (the "BRAUN Trademark"):

- International Trademark Registration No. 652027 for BRAUN (word mark), registered on November 14, 1995, notably covering China;
- International Trademark registration No. 650428 for BRAUN (word mark), registered on November 14, 1995, notably covering China;
- International Trademark Registration No. 1119262 for BRAUN (word mark), registered on March 16, 2012, notably designating China;
- Chinese Trademark Registration No. 44568020 for BRAUN (semi-figurative mark), registered on June 21, 2021.

The Complainants notably own the domain name <braun.com>, registered on June 24, 1997, which is used for the Complainants' US website dedicated to BRAUN products.

The Respondents registered the disputed domain names <braunb.com>, <brraun.com>, and <braunm.com> on July 6, 2025, and <nraun.com> on December 25, 2024. The Complainants contend that the disputed domain names are set with multiple redirects (not visible to Internet users), and finally redirect to the Complainants' US official website <braun.com>.

The Complainants sent several cease and desist letters through the Registrars. The Respondents did not provide any answer.

At the date of this Decision, the disputed domain names direct to an error page ("page not found").

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainants contend that they have satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names to the second Complainant, Braun GmbH.

First, the Complainants assert that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Complainants' BRAUN Trademark. The disputed domain names <braunm.com>, <braunb.com>, <brraun.com>, and <nraun.com> consist of misspellings of the BRAUN Trademark, which is clearly recognizable in all the disputed domain names. The fact that the disputed domain names include additional letters, namely, the letters "m", "b", and "r" in the case of the first three disputed domain names, and the fact that the letter "b" has been replaced with an "n" (an adjacent keyboard letter) in the case of the fourth disputed domain name, does not affect the confusing similarity. As to the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com", the gTLD is merely instrumental to its use on the Internet and shall be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

Second, the Complainants contend that the Respondents lack rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondents are not commonly known under the disputed domain names and do not own any trademark related to the disputed domain names. Furthermore, the Respondents have not provided the Complainants with any evidence of use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The disputed domain names have been pointed, via multiple 301 and 302 redirects, to the Complainants' US official website, thus generating the false impression that they are under control of the Complainants. Besides, the Respondents did not reply to the Complainants' cease and desist letters and contact requests.

Third, the Complainants assert that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. Concerning the registration in bad faith, the Complainants contend that the Respondents knew or should have known of the existence of the Complainants' BRAUN Trademark when they registered the disputed domain names as this trademark is well-known and widely used throughout the Internet. Moreover, the fact that the disputed domain names consist of clear misspellings of the Complainants' main domain name <braun.com> and are redirected to the Complainants' official US website suggests that Respondents were actually aware of the Complainants and their BRAUN Trademark.

Concerning the use of the disputed domain names, their redirection to the Complainants' official US website for BRAUN is clearly aimed at inducing Internet users to believe that the disputed domain names are owned and used by the Complainants or one of their affiliated entities. Such a conduct demonstrates that the sole purpose of the Respondents was and still is to take advantage of the Complainants' reputation and of the well-known character of the BRAUN Trademark, by causing an erroneous association with the Complainants, their activities, and marks.

As an additional circumstance evidencing bad faith, the Complainants note that both Respondents were involved in several prior UDRP disputes concerning domain names confusingly similar to the complainant's trademarks, which were concluded with the transfer of the disputed domain names to those complainants.

B. Respondents

The Respondents did not reply to the Complainants' contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Consolidation

Multiple Complainants

The Complainants request the Panel to accept the Complaint brought by the two Complainants against the Respondents in accordance with paragraph 10(e) of the Rules, which grants a panel the power to consolidate multiple domain name disputes. In assessing whether a joint complaint may be filed by multiple complainants, panels look at whether (i) the complainants have a specific common grievance against the respondent, or the respondent has engaged in common conduct that has affected the complainants in a similar fashion, and (ii) it would be equitable and procedurally efficient to permit the consolidation (WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions, "WIPO Overview 3.1", section 4.11.1).

The Complainants have jointly brought this proceeding against Respondents because the Complainants are related business organizations, whereby the first Complainant is the mother company of the second Complainant. Moreover, whereas the second Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for the BRAUN Trademark, the second Complainant is using the BRAUN Trademark in the course of business. The Panel finds that the Complainants have a specific common grievance against the Respondents, arising from a common interest in the BRAUN Trademark, and that the Respondents' conduct has adversely affected both. Additionally, consolidation would be equitable and procedurally efficient.

The Respondents have not contested consolidation.

As a result, the Panel accepts the consolidated Complaint against Respondents regarding the disputed domain names.

Multiple Respondents

According to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules, a panel may consolidate multiple domain name disputes upon the complainant's request. In addressing the complainant's request, the panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control, and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 4.11.2. Procedural efficiency would also underpin panel consideration of such a consolidation scenario.

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainants allege that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names have the same structure (they incorporate misspelled versions of the BRAUN Trademark and are registered in the same gTLD, ".com"), and three disputed domain names were registered on the same day. Moreover, the disputed domain names have been redirected since their registration, via multiple 301 and 302 redirects, to the same website and, ultimately, to the US official website of the Complainants.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party. The Panel notes that the Respondents did not comment on the Complainants' request for consolidation.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondents") in a single proceeding.

6.2. Substantive Elements

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that the Complainant proves each of the following three elements in order to succeed in its Complaint:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
(iii) the disputed domain name was 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 3.1, section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainants have shown rights in respect of a trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the BRAUN Trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. The disputed domain names consist of misspellings of the BRAUN Trademark, which is recognizable in all the disputed domain names. Domain names which consist of a variation of a trademark (typically a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling, referred to as typosquatting) are considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.9.

The fact that the disputed domain names include additional letters, namely, the letters "m", "b", and "r" in the case of the first three disputed domain names, and the fact that the letter "b" has been replaced with an "n" in the case of the fourth disputed domain name, does not affect the confusing similarity.

As to the addition of the gTLD ".com", the gTLD is merely instrumental to its use on the Internet and shall be disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the BRAUN Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

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 Complainants have established a prima facie case that the Respondents lack rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondents have not rebutted the Complainants' prima facie showing and have not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Based on the available records, the Respondents are not licensed by or affiliated with the Complainants in any way. Based on the available records, the Panel further finds that there is no evidence that the Respondents are commonly known by the disputed domain names, nor is there any evidence of use or demonstrable plans to use the disputed domain names for a bona fide offering of goods or services. There is no evidence of legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names, either. On the contrary, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names redirected to the Complainants' official US website, thus generating the false impression that they are under control of the Complainants. At the date of this Decision, they resolve to an error page. Such use can be considered neither as a bona fide offering of goods or services nor as a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names.

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.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

Concerning the registration of the disputed domain names, the Panel first notes that the well-known character of the BRAUN Trademark was recognized by several prior UDRP panel decisions. See, inter alia, in *The Procter & Gamble Company and Braun GmbH v. Domain Admin, FBS INC, Whoisprotection.biz / Erol Çakir*, WIPO Case No. D2020-1959 and *Braun GmbH v. Do Van Tuan*, WIPO Case No. D2014-0832.

The disputed domain names are clearly misspellings of the Complainants' well-known BRAUN Trademark:

- The disputed domain name <braunb.com> is a misspelling of the BRAUN Trademark as it is composed by the BRAUN Trademark followed by the letter "b", which is directly preceding the letter "n" on the commonly used QUERTY keyboard, rendering the misspelling likely for Internet users;
- The disputed domain name <braunm.com> is a misspelling of the BRAUN Trademark as it is composed by the BRAUN Trademark followed by the letter "m", which is directly succeeding the letter "n" on the commonly used QUERTY keyboard, rendering the misspelling likely for Internet users;
- The disputed domain name <brraun.com> is a misspelling of the BRAUN Trademark as it is composed of the BRAUN Trademark whereby the letter "r" has been repeated, which is again an obvious misspelling;
- The disputed domain name <nraun.com> consist of a misspelling of the BRAUN Trademark, as it is composed by the BRAUN Trademark, whereby the first letter ("b") has been replaced with the letter "n" which is directly succeeding the letter "b" on the commonly used QUERTY keyboard.

The Panel also notes that the Complainants own registrations for the BRAUN Trademark in China and are carrying business in China under the BRAUN Trademark, where the Respondents are purportedly located.

Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos) to a well-known trademark, and particularly in the case of coined or fanciful marks, can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, Section 3.1.4.

Noting the near instantaneous and global reach of the Internet and search engines, and particularly in circumstances where the complainant's mark is widely known and a respondent cannot credibly claim to have been unaware of the mark, panels have been prepared to infer that the respondent knew, or have found that the respondent should have known, that its registration would be confusingly similar to a complainant's mark. In the present case, the Panel notes the well-known character of the BRAUN

Trademark, already recognized by the UDRP panel decisions mentioned above. Besides, the Panel notes that a quick search for the term "braun" online (which is a fanciful term), would have revealed to the Respondents the existence of the Complainants and their BRAUN Trademark. Taking into account the fact that the disputed domain names are clearly misspellings of the BRAUN Trademark, and the fact that the Complainants own registrations for the BRAUN Trademark in China and are carrying business in China (where the Respondents are purportedly located), the Panel finds that the Respondents were more likely than not aware of the Complainants' BRAUN Trademark at the time of the registration of the disputed domain names. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.2

Concerning the use in bad faith, the Panel notes that, according to the Complaint and the available records, the disputed domain names redirected to the Complainants' official US website for BRAUN, which can induce Internet users to believe that the disputed domain names are owned and used by the Complainants or one of their affiliated entities. Such a conduct demonstrates that the sole purpose of the Respondents was to take advantage of the Complainants' reputation and of the well-known character of the BRAUN Trademark, by causing an erroneous association with the Complainants, their activities and the BRAUN Trademark. The practice of typosquatting, as evidenced by the registration of the disputed domain names that are slight misspellings or variations of the Complainants' BRAUN Trademark, illustrates a clear intention to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion.

As an additional circumstance evidencing bad faith, the Panel further notes that both Respondents were involved in several prior UDRP disputes concerning domain names confusingly similar to the complainant's trademarks, which were concluded with the transfer of the disputed domain names to the complainants (concerning the first Respondent, see *ecoATM, LLC v. Albert Smith*, WIPO Case No. D2025-1501; concerning the second Respondent, see e.g. *ZipRecruiter, Inc. v. Zhichao*, WIPO Case No. D2025-3387; *Laboratoires M&L v. Zhichao*, WIPO Case No. D2025-2680).

The disputed domain names currently resolve to an error page. Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3. Although panelists will look at the totality of the circumstances in each case, factors that have been considered relevant in applying the passive holding doctrine include: (i) the degree of distinctiveness or reputation of the complainant's mark; (ii) the failure of the respondent to submit a response or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use; and (iii) the respondent's taking active steps to conceal its identity or use of false contact details (noted to be in breach of its registration agreement). In this respect, the Panel notes the well-known character of the BRAUN Trademark and the composition of the disputed domain names (which are clearly misspellings of the BRAUN Trademark). The Panel also notes the failure of the Respondents to submit a response. The Panel finds that in the circumstances of this case, the passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainants have 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 names <braunb.com>, <braunm.com>, <brraun.com> and <nraun.com> be transferred to the second Complainant, Braun GmbH.

/Mireille Buydens/
Mireille Buydens
Sole Panelist
Date: April 21, 2026