

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

AS Beauty Group LLC v. 王士飞

Case No. D2025-2282

1. The Parties

The Complainant is AS Beauty Group LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Dorsey & Whitney, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is 王士飞, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <lauragellerus.beauty>, <lauragellerusofficial.top>, <lauragellerus.top>, <laurageller.top> and <laurugeller.top> are registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 11, 2025. On June 12, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On June 13, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response, disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names 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 June 16, 2025, 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 June 18, 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 June 20, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 10, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 14, 2025.

The Center appointed Karen Fong as the sole panelist in this matter on July 17, 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

Based in New York, United States, the Complainant is the owner of the LAURA GELLER and LAURA GELLER NEW YORK trade marks. The brand was founded by the make up artist Laura Geller in 1993 who opened a make up studio in New York. In 1997, she launched a make up line under her own name. The Complainant acquired the brand in 2019. In 2023, its annual sales exceeded USD 100 million.

The Complainant's trade mark registrations include the following:

- United States Trade Mark Registration No. 3527188 for LAURA GELLER registered on November 4, 2008;
- United States Trade Mark Registration No. 4787513 for LAURA GELLER & Device registered on August 4, 2015; and
- United States Trade Mark Registration No. 5495610 for LAURA GELLER NEW YORK registered on June 19, 2018.

(individually and collectively referred to as the "Trade Mark").

The Complainant's own website is at the domain name <laurageller.com>.

The Respondent, who appears to be based in China, registered the disputed domain names on the following dates:

- <lauragellerus.beauty> - May 13, 2025
- <lauragellerusofficial.top> - May 28, 2025
- <lauragellerus.top> - May 13, 2025
- <laurergeller.top> - May 28, 2025
- <laurugeller.top> - April 16, 2025

The disputed domain names all resolve to websites which display the Trade Mark (or in the case of two of the disputed domain names, a misspelling of the Trade Mark - LUARA GELLER, LARUA GELLER and LAURA GELLFR) prominently, mimics the Complainant's own website including using its images and purportedly offers for sale merchandise that bears the Trade Mark at discounted or "sale" prices and purports to be the Complainant's products (the "Websites").

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the Trade Mark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain names, and that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith.

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the entirety of the Trade Mark is reproduced within the disputed domain names <lauragellerus.beauty, <lauragellerusofficial.top> and <lauragellerus.top>. Further, the Trade Mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names, <laurergeller.top> and <laurugeller.top>, being an intentional misspelling of the Trade Mark. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7 and 1.9.

While the addition of the other terms here, "us" and "official" after the Trade Mark in the disputed domain names may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Based on the available record, 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.

While 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 often impossible 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. 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 record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Moreover, the nature of the disputed domain names, adding the geographic term "us" and the term "official" to the Complainants' Trade Mark, coupled with the use of the disputed domain names discussed above, affirms the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain names and the Complainant as to the origin or affiliation of the Websites.

Based on the available record, 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 must have been aware of the Trade Mark when he/she registered the disputed domain names given the Trade Mark was registered prior to registration of the disputed domain names and the use of the Trade Mark on the Websites. It is therefore implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant when he/she registered the disputed domain names.

In the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2 states as follows:

“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 (including in its sector) or highly specific and a respondent cannot credibly claim to have been unaware of the mark (particularly in the case of domainers), panels have been prepared to infer that the respondent knew, or have found that the respondent should have known, that its registration would be identical or confusingly similar to a complainant's mark. Further factors including the nature of the domain name, the chosen top-level domain, any use of the domain name, or any respondent pattern, may obviate a respondent's claim not to have been aware of the complainant's mark.”

The fact that there is a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain names without any explanation is also a significant factor to consider (as stated in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1). The disputed domain names fall into the category stated above and the Panel finds that registration is in bad faith. The fact that two of the disputed domain name are a deliberate misspelling of the Trade Mark, and the addition of the terms “us” and “official” after the Trade Mark in the other three disputed domain names - as well as the registration of the generic Top-Level Domain “.beauty” in one instance further indicates that the Respondent specifically targeted the Complainant when registering the disputed domain names given that the Complainant is based in the United States and offers beauty products under the Trade Mark.

The disputed domain names are also being used in bad faith. The products offered for sale on the Websites are likely to be counterfeit and/or unauthorised LAURA GELLER products considering the products sold on the Websites are heavily discounted and the fact that there is no relationship between the Parties.

That being said, it is not necessary for the Panel to make any ultimate determination as to the nature of the products, as the evidence clearly shows that the Websites have prominently displayed the Trade Mark (or misspelling of it), with a vague disclaimer “We Are an Informational Website. Please Refer to the Retailer's Website for All Purchase Related Information”, which, in the Panel's view, does not disclose (the lack of) relationship between the Parties. Furthermore, the Websites displayed discounted prices and some of them offered the “Add to Cart” options. The content of the Websites, including the presence of the copyright notices, is calculated to give the impression they have been authorized by or connected to the Complainant when this is not the case. The Websites were set up to deliberately mislead Internet users into believing that they are connected to, authorised by or affiliated with the Complainant. From the above, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by misleading them into believing that the Websites are, and the products sold on them are those of or authorised or endorsed by the Complainant.

It is highly likely that Internet users when typing the disputed domain names into their browser or finding them through a search engine would have been looking for a site operated by the Complainant rather than the Respondent. The disputed domain names are likely to confuse Internet users trying to find the Complainant's official website.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

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 <lauragellerus.beauty>, <lauragellerusofficial.top>, <lauragellerus.top>, <laurergeller.top> and <laurugeller.top> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Karen Fong/

Karen Fong

Sole Panelist

Date: July 26, 2025