

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Linhope International Limited, Sirens Design Limited, Linhope International (UK) Limited, Original Beauty Technology Company Limited v. Felix Dresn
Case No. D2025-0969

1. The Parties

The Complainants are Linhope International Limited, Hong Kong, China ("First Complainant"), Sirens Design Limited, United Kingdom ("Second Complainant"), Linhope International (UK) Limited, United Kingdom ("Third Complainant"), Original Beauty Technology Company Limited, Hong Kong, China ("Fourth Complainant"), all represented by GSC Solicitors LLP, United Kingdom ("UK").

The Respondent is Felix Dresn, France.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <houseofcb-uae.com> is registered with 1API GmbH (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 10, 2025. On March 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 11, 2025, 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 (Persons Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainants on March 12, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainants to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainants filed an amended Complaint on March 21, 2025.

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 March 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 13, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any Response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 19, 2025.

The Center appointed Mladen Vukmir as the sole panelist in this matter on April 28, 2025. 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 and the Fourth Complainants are China-based companies, while the Second and the Third Complainants are the UK-based companies. The Third Complainant is a wholly owned subsidiary of the First Complainant. The Complainants are engaged in the business of clothing and accessories.

The First Complainant is the owner of numerous HOUSE OF CB trademark registrations worldwide, including HOUSE OF CB series of trademark (HOUSE OF CB, houseofcb, house of cb) registered in the UK on January 2, 2015, under the registration number UK00003068906 for goods and services in classes 3, 9, 14, 18, and 25 of International Classification ("IC"). The First Complainant licensed the Fourth Complainant the trademark rights over the UK00003068906, HOUSE OF CB trademark, and the Fourth Complainant is recorded in the UK trademark register as the exclusive licensee of this trademark series.

The Third Complainant is the owner of HOUSE OF CB trademark registered in European Union on August 25, 2020, under the registration number 018232169 for goods and services in classes 3, 9, 14, 18, and 25 of IC, and HOUSEOFBBLONDON series of trademark (HOUSEOFBBLONDON, houseofbblondon, HouseofBBLondon, House of CB London) registered in the UK on October 23, 2020, under the registration number UK00003477882 for goods and services in classes 3, 9, 14, 18, and 25 of IC. According to the Complainants, the Third Complainant granted an exclusive license over its UK00003477882, HOUSEOFBBLONDON trademark to the Fourth Complainant.

In this Decision, the First Complainant, the Second Complainant, the Third Complainant, and the Fourth Complainant will be referred to as "the Complainant".

The Complainant has established presence on the Internet and owns or controls domain name containing HOUSE OF CB trademark, including <houseofcb.com> registered on December 26, 2013.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 18, 2023, and resolves to a website reproducing the Complainant's HOUSE OF CB trademark, and operating as an online store where allegedly the Complainant's products are being offered for sale.

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:

(i) From 2014 to 2022, the Fourth Complainant traded as "HOUSE OF CB" and "HOUSE OF CB LONDON" worldwide through the website created under the domain name <houseofcb.com>, through branded stores and concessions within stores in the UK, United States of America ("USA") and Australia. The Fourth Complainant's business was promoted by social media including on Instagram (@houseofcb) and Twitter (@HouseOfCB), and was enormously successful. The Instagram account (@houseofcb) had in excess of 3 million followers and its Twitter account (@HouseOfCB) had about 106,000 followers. The Fourth Complainant's garments proved popular with celebrities, many of which were frequently photographed in the Complainant's wares and publicized as such. In 2022, the First and the Third Complainants granted non-exclusive licenses to the Second and Fourth Complainants to permit them to use HOUSE OF CB trademark,

and the Fourth Complainant transferred its business assets to the Second Complainant, including its intellectual property rights in its images, garment designs, website designs, etc. The Second Complainant now trades as "HOUSE OF CB", "HOUSE OF CB LONDON" worldwide through a website created under the domain name <houseofcb.com>, through branded stores and concessions within stores in the UK, USA and Australia. The Second Complainant now operates social media accounts, and is continuing to sell garments and accessories;

(ii) The disputed domain name is similar to HOUSE OF CB trademark;

(iii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name was registered more than 9 years after the Fourth Complainant commenced trading under the "HOUSE OF CB" name, and 8 years after the first HOUSE OF CB trademark was registered. Images of garments from the Second Complainant's website have been copied and displayed on the website created under the disputed domain name. The Complainant considers that the Respondent's activities in this regard amount to infringement of copyright in the photographs that appear on the Second Complainant's website. The use of HOUSE OF CB trademark in the disputed domain name, the display of an identical logo on the Respondent's website, the use of the Second Complainant's images to sell identical goods on a website that has similar look as the Second Complainant's, amounts to a fraudulent scheme to induce public to pay either for counterfeit copies of the Second Complainant's garments, or for the garments which are never delivered. The Complainant suspects that the Respondent is not a genuine person, that its name is invented and that the Respondent's address registered with the registrar does not exist;

(iv) The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith for purpose of a fraudulent scheme to deceive the public, divert sales from the Complainant and to take illegitimate advantage of the Complainant's valuable goodwill and reputation.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Issue - Consolidation of Complainants

Affiliated companies have standing to file a complaint under the Policy. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.4.1.

In assessing whether a complaint filed by multiple complainants may be brought against a single respondent, 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 3.0](#), section 4.11.1.

The Complaint was filed by four Complainants who allege multiple mutual relations. The owners of HOUSE OF CB trademarks are the First and the Third Complainants. The Second and the Fourth Complainants are licensed to use HOUSE OF CB trademarks. The Fourth Complainant is also registered as a licensee of the First Complainant's trademarks. The Third Complainant is a wholly owned subsidiary of the First Complainant.

The inclusion of the HOUSE OF CB trademark in the disputed domain name directly impacts the rights of all the Complainants, who trade together and thus share a common interest and grievance regarding the Respondent's actions.

This Panel affirms that the First, the Second, the Third and the Fourth Complainant, jointly comprising the Complainant, have a specific common grievance, and it is equitable and procedurally efficient to allow consolidation in circumstances of this case.

6.2. Substantive Issues

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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a HOUSE OF CB trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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 trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant's HOUSE OF CB trademark followed by a hyphen and a term "uae" which is a geographic term, abbreviation for the United Arab Emirates. Where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, adding other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, meaningless, or otherwise), would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Regarding the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" in the disputed domain name, as a standard registration requirement it should be disregarded under the confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

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. 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 is not authorized by the Complainant to use HOUSE OF CB trademark, and there is no indication that the Respondent is known under the disputed domain name. There is no apparent relation from the records between the Respondent and the Complainant, neither does it arise that the Complainant has ever licensed or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its trademark, or to apply for or use any

domain name incorporating the same trademark. There is no evidence in the case file or otherwise apparent to the Panel that the Respondent has been using the disputed domain name in connection with bona fide offering of goods or services or making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

The Panel notes the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name in connection with an online store in which the Complainant's trademark is reproduced, displaying images of garments from the Complainant's website "www.houseofcb.com", to purportedly sell products that seem identical to the Complainant's products.

The Panel notes the Complainant's claims that the Respondent is using the website for a fraudulent scheme to either sell counterfeits or garments which are never delivered. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here sale of potentially counterfeit goods can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1. The Panel finds that the disputed domain name and its website have been selected and developed in such a manner to create the impression of being a website of the Complainant to purport to sell the Complainant's products at heavily discounted prices. The Panel considers that such registration and use of the disputed domain name cannot give rise to rights or legitimate interests.

The Respondent has failed to provide a Response to the Complaint, and accordingly failed to rebut the Complainant's showing that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name.

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 has registered the disputed domain name 8 years after the Complainant registered its first HOUSE OF CB trademark, and nearly 10 years after registration of the Complainant's <houseofcb.com> domain name. The disputed domain name is highly similar to the Complainant's HOUSE OF CB trademark and <houseofcb.com> domain name. The Respondent's addition of the hyphen and term "uae" in the disputed domain name results only in minor variation from the Complainant's HOUSE OF CB trademark and domain name.

The Respondent used the disputed domain name to create a website - online store. On the Respondent's website, the Complainant's HOUSE OF CB trademark and images of the Complainant's products from the Complainant's official website, are reproduced. Products on the Respondent's website are presented in the same manner as the products on the Complainant's official website, and products that seem to be the Complainant's are being offered for sale on the Respondent's website. The Respondent's ongoing unauthorized use of the Complainant's HOUSE OF CB trademark in the disputed domain name, and high similarity of the disputed domain name and the Complainant's <houseofcb.com> domain name give an incorrect impression to the visitors of the Respondent's website that the Respondent is connected to the Complainant.

This Panel finds the Complainant's HOUSE OF CB trademark well known within the garment industry. Taking into consideration all circumstances and evidence presented, the Panel believes that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and targeted its HOUSE OF CB trademark at the time when it registered the disputed domain name. The Panel is of opinion that, by registering the disputed domain name that contains the Complainant's HOUSE OF CB trademark, the Respondent is attempting to take advantage of the Complainant's reputation, and well-known trademark.

In this Panel's view, the Respondent is, by using HOUSE OF CB trademark in the disputed domain name, intentionally attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its HOUSE OF CB trademarks. It is well established that if a respondent has intentionally attempted to attract for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's trademark it is an indicator of bad faith.

Thus, the Panel finds that the Respondent is using the disputed domain names intentionally to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its HOUSE OF CB trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the Respondent's websites or of the products on the Respondent's websites.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes 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 <houseofcb-uae.com> be transferred to the Second Complainant.

/Mladen Vukmir/

Mladen Vukmir

Sole Panelist

Date: May 12, 2025