ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Byoma Limited v. Lebram Kent
Case No. D2026-1591

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Byoma Limited, United Kingdom, represented by SafeNames Ltd., United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Lebram Kent, United States of America ("United States" or "U.S.").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <byomaonline.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 April 15, 2026. On April 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 17, 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 / Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 21, 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 April 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 April 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 14, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 15, 2026.

The Center appointed Shwetasree Majumder as the sole panelist in this matter on May 20, 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 Byoma Limited, a skincare company founded in 2020 in Scotland, United Kingdom which offers skincare products for the face and body under the mark BYOMA. The Complainant's mark BYOMA is a coined mark and does not have any dictionary meaning.

The Complainant's official business website is "www.byoma.com". The domain name <byoma.com> was registered on March 3, 2016.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for its mark BYOMA in several jurisdictions. The details of a few such registrations are as below:

- BYOMA – Australia Registration No. 2167020 in classes 3 and 25 registered on March 29, 2021;

- BYOMA – United Kingdom Registration No. UK00003610176 in classes 3 and 25 registered on August 6, 2021; and

- BYOMA – U.S. Registration No. 6690108 in classes 3 and 35 registered on April 5, 2022.

The disputed domain name <byomaonline.com> was registered on February 26, 2026. The disputed domain name is parked and does not resolve into a website.

The Complainant had sent cease-and-desist notices to the Respondent on March 24, 2026 and also on March 31, 2026, but did not receive any reply from the Respondent.

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 is one of the skincare companies under the parent company Bansk Group. The Complainant contends that it is the owner of the registered trademark BYOMA and holds registrations in several countries. The Complainant launched its products under its mark BYOMA in 2022. The Complainant contends that its products are available online and in stores through its website, including in the United Kingdom, United States, Asia, and Europe. The Complainant contends that it generated USD 500 million in sales in the year 2025. The Complainant argues that it has a strong social media presence under the mark BYOMA.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark BYOMA. The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name encompasses the entirety of the Complainant's trademark BYOMA with the addition of the term "online". The Complainant further states that BYOMA is the dominant and distinctive element in the disputed domain name. The Complainant further states that the addition of the term "online" is not sufficient to alleviate the likelihood of confusion between the trademark BYOMA and the disputed domain name. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent neither has any trademark rights nor retains any unregistered trademark rights to the term BYOMA. The Complainant further argues that they never gave any license to the Respondent to use any domain names featuring the BYOMA trademark. The Complainant submits that the Respondent has not used, nor prepared to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. In support of this claim, the Complainant points out the fact that the disputed domain name currently resolves to an inactive website. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent is not commonly known by the term BYOMA, nor is offering any genuine goods or services under the same term. The Complainant further states that the Respondent has no plausible reason for the registration and use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant asserts that the Complainant's earliest trademark registration predates the creation of the disputed domain name by approximately five years. Further, the Complainant also sent cease-and-desist notices to the Respondent on March 24, 2026 and March 31, 2026, to put the Respondent on notice of the Complainant's rights. However, the Respondent chose not to respond to either of the notices. In this regard the Complainant has relied on previous Panel decisions where a lack of reply to a cease-and-desist notice prior to commencing the proceedings infers bad faith behaviour, *Facebook, Inc. and Instagram, LLC v. CW / c.w, c w,* WIPO Case No. D2018-1159 and *Telstra Corporation Limited v. Nuclear Marshmallows*, WIPO Case No. D2000-0003.

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 Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, 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 3.1, section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms "online" 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 Respondent neither has any trademark rights for BYOMA nor retains any unregistered trademark rights to the term BYOMA. The Complainant never gave any license to the Respondent to use the disputed domain name featuring the mark BYOMA. The disputed domain name currently does not resolve into an active website. The Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services. The Panel notes that the Complainant's mark BYOMA is a coined and invented mark, and hence there is no plausible justification for the Respondent to register or use the disputed domain name wholly incorporating the mark BYOMA. There is no evidence that the Respondent has ever been commonly known by the disputed domain name or the term BYOMA within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

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 Respondent had registered the disputed domain name which is confusingly similar to Complainant's mark. Further, the Complainant sent two cease-and-desist notices and gave an opportunity to the Respondent to provide evidence of any actual good faith use. However, the Respondent chose not to respond to either of the notices. Further the Respondent chose not to respond to the present proceedings either. The Panel further notes that BYOMA is a coined and invented term with no dictionary meaning, making it highly improbable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's mark. The Panel also notes that the Respondent concealed its identity through a privacy service at the time of registration, which, in combination with the other circumstances of this case, is a relevant consideration in assessing bad faith. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.6.

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 3.1, section 3.2.1.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name including a blank page would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy. In reaching this conclusion, the Panel has had regard to the following: (i) the Complainant's mark BYOMA enjoys a strong reputation and wide recognition in the skincare industry; (ii) the Respondent has provided no evidence of any actual or contemplated good-faith use of the disputed domain name; (iii) the Respondent concealed its identity through a privacy service at the time of registration;

and (iv) it is not possible to conceive of any plausible legitimate use of the disputed domain name - which reproduces the entirety of a coined and invented mark with the addition of the generic word “online” - that would not be illegitimate.

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 <byomaonline.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Shwetasree Majumder/
Shwetasree Majumder
Sole Panelist
Date: June 3, 2026