

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

iFamilySC Co., Ltd. v. Tran Manh Tuan  
Case No. D2025-2322

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is iFamilySC Co., Ltd., Republic of Korea, represented by Marq Vision Inc., United States of America.<sup>1</sup>

The Respondent is Tran Manh Tuan, Viet Nam.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <romandvietnam.com> is registered with Mat Bao Corporation (the “Registrar”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 13, 2025. On June 13, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 16, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing additional contact information for the disputed domain name. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 18, 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 amendment to the Complaint on June 19, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 23, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 13, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on July 22, 2025.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Panel notes that iFamilySC Co., Ltd. is listed as the Complainant throughout the Complaint. However, in paragraph 2 of the Complaint, both an individual and iFamilySC Co., Ltd. are listed as the Complainants. Since the Complainant did not clarify the relationship between the individual and iFamilySC Co., Ltd., the Panel only considers iFamilySC Co., Ltd. as the Complainant in this case.

The Center appointed Keiji Kondo as the sole panelist in this matter on August 4, 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 Complainant is a Republic of Korea business entity in the global skincare and cosmetics industry. It is known for its brand ROM&ND. The ROM&ND brand cosmetics are distributed across numerous countries.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for ROMAND or ROM&ND in jurisdictions such as Republic of Korea, China, and Viet Nam. A summary of the Complainant's trademark registration in Republic of Korea is as follows:

Trademark: ROMAND;  
Registration No.: 4500732800000;  
Registration Date: April 26, 2017; and  
Goods and Services: NICE Classifications 3 and 35.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 18, 2024, and is used for a website purportedly offering cosmetics for sale. The trademarks ROM&ND and ROMAND are prominently used in the Respondent's website. The copyright notice of the Respondent's website indicates that "Copyright belongs to Romand Vietnam".

#### **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 identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's trademark ROMAND in its entirety. Although it includes the geographic term "vietnam" and the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com", these additions do not eliminate the confusing similarity with the Complainant's trademark. The inclusion of "vietnam", a geographic descriptor, alongside "romand" creates a misleading impression that the disputed domain name may officially represent the Complainant's operations in Viet Nam.

The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, as supported by the following facts:

- i. the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name;
- ii. the Respondent has not acquired trademark or service mark rights;
- iii. there is no relationship or affiliation between the Complainant and the Respondent that would give rise to any license, permission, or other right under which the Respondent could own or use any domain name incorporating the Complainant's ROMAND mark; and
- iv. the Respondent is not engaged in bona fide offering of goods or services but has used the disputed domain name in connection with a website that misleads consumers into thinking that the website is operated by the Complainant, and is now holding the disputed domain name for commercial gain.

The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Given the renowned and distinctive nature of the ROMAND trademark and descriptions on the Respondent's website, it is evident that at the time of registration, the Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and its trademark. Moreover, a simple trademark search or Internet query would have revealed the Complainant's trademark registrations. Throughout this Complaint, further evidence explained below proves that the disputed domain name has been registered and used in bad faith.

First, the registration of the disputed domain name demonstrates clear evidence of bad faith. The Complainant has established a strong global presence in the beauty and skincare industry through its flagship brand ROM&ND, which is widely recognized for its innovative and high-quality cosmetic products. The disputed domain name wholly incorporates the Complainant's trademark ROMAND, adding only the generic geographic term "vietnam", which does not serve to distinguish it from the Complainant's mark. This combination strongly suggests an intent to trade off the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant by misleading users into believing that the disputed domain name is affiliated with or endorsed by the Complainant.

Second, the use of the Complainant's trademark on the website at the disputed domain name further reinforces the inference of bad faith. As shown in the screenshots submitted in Annex 8 to the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that prominently displays the ROMAND trademark in the top-left corner of the homepage. The website purports to offer goods identical or similar to those of the Complainant, using product photographs—including altered versions of official images taken from the Complainant's website. Additionally, as evidenced in Annexes 9 and 10 to the Complaint, the Respondent uses the phrase "genuine product lipstick" in its product catalog and misappropriates the Complainant's official logo in the product images. These deceptive practices are clearly intended to impersonate the Complainant, mislead consumers, and benefit commercially from unauthorized use of the Complainant's intellectual property.

Third, the Respondent's conduct amounts to deliberate impersonation and fraudulent activity, evidencing bad faith in both the registration and use of the disputed domain name. By impersonating the Complainant and exploiting its brand for financial gain, the Respondent not only misleads consumers but also puts them at risk of harm, including potential fraud or phishing.

In conclusion, the Respondent has clearly engaged in a pattern of bad faith behavior—registering and using the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant, deceive users, and unlawfully profit from the Complainant's trademark rights and reputation. This includes acts of passing off, phishing, and unauthorized commercial use of the Complainant's marks, which not only exploit consumer trust but also pose serious risks to user safety and the Complainant's brand integrity.

## **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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)), section 1.7.

The Complainant has a trademark registration for ROMAND. The entirety of the Complainant's trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. The addition of the term "vietnam" does not prevent a finding

of confusing similarity with the Complainant's trademark. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

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.

The name of the Respondent is Tran Manh Tuan, which is not at all similar to the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant contends that there is no relationship or affiliation between the Complainant and the Respondent that would give rise to any license, permission, or other right under which the Respondent could use the Complainant's trademark to identify itself. Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has not been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name is used for a website where the Complainant's trademarks are prominently displayed, and the purported Complainant's cosmetics are displayed for sale without any disclaimer clarifying the (lack of) relationship between the Parties. Therefore, the use of the disputed domain name cannot be regarded as fair or noncommercial use.

Finally, as discussed below with respect to the third element of the Policy, the use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent cannot be regarded as use in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

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, failing to submit any response to the Complainant's contentions, 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 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.

For the following reasons, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website:

- i. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name about seven years after the Complainant's trademark registration;
- ii. A note reading "we earn commissions from qualifying transactions through the affiliate marketing program" appears on the Respondent website, falsely suggesting the Respondent's affiliation with the Complainant;
- iii. The copyright notice of the Respondent's website refers to the Complainant brand ("Copyright belongs to Romand Vietnam"), falsely suggesting the Respondent's affiliation with the Complainant; and
- iv. The Complainant's trademark ROM&ND is used in a fashion to give an impression that the Respondent's website is authorized by the Complainant.

Accordingly, 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 <romandvietnam.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Keiji Kondo/*

**Keiji Kondo**

Sole Panelist

Date: August 18, 2025