

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Tangle Teezer Ltd v. Yurii Portnov
Case No. D2025-2335

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Tangle Teezer Ltd, United Kingdom, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Yurii Portnov, Russian Federation.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <tangleteezer.pro> is registered with Registrar of Domain Names REG.RU LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 13, 2025. On June 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 17, 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 (Registrant Information Redacted / Personal data, can not be publicly disclosed according to applicable laws) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 17, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint.

On June 17, 2025 the Center informed the Parties in Russian and English, that the language of the registration agreement for the disputed domain name is Russian. On June 18, 2025, the Complainant filed an amended Complaint containing a request for English to be the language of the proceedings. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission but sent an email communication in English on June 18, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with 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 in English and Russian of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 30, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 20, 2025.

The Center appointed Alissia Shchichka as the sole panelist in this matter on July 23, 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 company based in the United Kingdom that specializes in hair care products, in particular hairbrushes. It was founded in 2007 and, by 2011, reported annual revenues of approximately GBP 28.6 million. In 2012, it received the “Queen’s Award for Innovation”, and in 2013, it was listed 19th in the Sunday Times Fast Track 100 ranking of private companies in the United Kingdom. In December 2024, the Complainant announced its acquisition by BIC SA for approximately EUR 200 million.

The Complainant has evidenced to be the registered owner of numerous trademarks worldwide relating to its trademarks TANGLE TEEZER including, but not limited, to the following:

- International Trademark Registration No. 953741, registered on January 25, 2008, in classes 3, 21, and 25;
- International Trademark Registration No. 1262393 (figurative), registered on November 4, 2014, in classes 3, 8, 11, 21, 26, 35, and 44;
- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00904345963, registered on April 26, 2006, in classes 3, 21, and 25; and
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 004345963, registered on April 26, 2006, in classes 3, 21, and 25.

The Complainant also owns the domain name <tangleteezer.com> which has served as its official website since at least 2011.

The aforementioned trademarks and domain name were registered prior to the disputed domain name, which was registered on March 6, 2025. The disputed domain name resolves to a parked Registrar website and is inactive.

The Respondent, according to the disclosed Whois information for the disputed domain name, is located in the Russian Federation.

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.

According to the Complainant, the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s trademark TANGLE TEEZER, as it incorporates the trademark in its entirety. The Complainant emphasizes that the Top-Level Domain (“TLD”) “.pro”, should be disregarded under the first element analysis, as it is a standard registration requirement and does not affect the assessment of confusing similarity.

Furthermore, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name for the following reasons:

First, the Respondent is not affiliated with, licensed by, or otherwise authorized the Complainant to use the TANGLE TEEZER trademark in connection with the disputed domain name.

Second, the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Third, the disputed domain name resolves to a parked Registrar page without any content or commercial activity. The Respondent has not demonstrated any intent to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Fourth, while there is no current evidence that the disputed domain name has been used for fraudulent purposes, the presence of active [email exchange] (MX) records strongly suggests the potential for future email-related activity.

Finally, the disputed domain name was registered well after the Complainant had established significant global recognition of its trademark. In such circumstances, the disputed domain name carries a high risk of implied affiliation, which cannot constitute fair use.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

First, the Complainant's well-known TANGLE TEEZER trademark significantly predates the registration of the disputed domain name, therefore the Respondent knew or should have known of the existence of the Complainant's trademark.

Second, the incorporation of a well-known trademark into the disputed domain name by an unaffiliated entity can, by itself, create a presumption of bad faith.

Third, the currently inactive status of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions. However, on June 18, 2025 the Respondent sent an email to the Center stating:

"I am informing you of the following. Please send proof that you are the owner of this trademark. This may be a trademark registration certificate, marked with the serial number and the date of issue. Upon presentation of this document, I will delete this domain name. But at the moment, I have every right to buy these domain names on such sites. If you have any more questions or requirements, write in Russian, I'm not going to contact translators and pay money, you need it, not me".

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Issue: Language of the Proceedings

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Russian. Pursuant to paragraph 11(a) of the Rules, in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless otherwise specified in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceedings shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requests that the language of the proceedings be English, for the following reasons:

- The Complainant is unable to communicate in Russian, and translating the Complaint would impose an unfair burden, causing unnecessary delay in the resolution of the matter;
- Considering the abusive nature of the disputed domain name, requiring translation would prolong the risk of confusion for consumers;
- The disputed domain name is composed entirely of English-language terms, and has no particular meaning in the Russian language;
- Prior to filing this Complaint, the Complainant sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent. The Respondent did not reply, nor did they request communication in Russian. The Respondent has therefore had an opportunity to raise a language objection and failed to do so.

In light of the above, the Complainant submits that, in light of the Respondent's decision to register a domain name that is identical to the Complainant's trademark, it would unduly burden the Complainant to have to arrange and pay for translation where the Respondent has demonstrated behavior that disrupts the Complainant's business.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.5.1.

In addition, the Center has communicated with the Respondent in both English and Russian and invited the Respondent to comment on the language of the proceedings. The Respondent has not submitted any formal response or objection to the Complainant's request that the proceedings be conducted in English. The Panel takes note of the Respondent's request drafted in English for further communications to be sent in Russian. In this regard, the Panel notes that the Center notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and sent all case-related communications to the Parties, in both Russian and English.

Furthermore, the Panel is proficient in both English and Russian, capable of reviewing all the documents and materials in both languages, and giving full consideration to the Parties' respective arguments. The Panel would have considered a Response in Russian, but none was filed.

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceedings shall be English.

6.2. Substantive Issues

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant carries the burden of proving:

- (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Respondent's failure to file any substantive submissions in present case does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant, however, paragraph 5(f) of the Rules provides that if the Respondent does not submit a response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute based upon the Complaint.

Further, according to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences from the Respondent's failure to submit a substantive response as it considers appropriate.

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 trademark or service mark 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 identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), 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 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 Panel notes that there is no relationship - disclosed to the Panel or otherwise apparent from the record - between the Respondent and the Complainant. The Complainant has confirmed that the Respondent is not affiliated with it, or otherwise authorized or licensed to use the TANGLE TEEZER trademark or to seek registration of any domain name incorporating that trademark. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor any indication that the Respondent has acquired any rights in the trademark. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.3.

There is also no evidence that the Respondent has used, or made demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor for any legitimate noncommercial or fair use, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Complainant's trademark.

The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name, being identical to the Complainant's trademark TANGLE TEEZER, carries a high risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Accordingly, the Complainant has provided sufficient evidence supporting its prima facie claim that the Respondent lacks any 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.

Therefore, the Panel concludes that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and the Complainant has met its burden under paragraph 4(a)(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 observes that the Complainant's TANGLE TEEZER trademark predates the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name. Given the prior registration, use, and widespread reputation of the Complainant's trademark in connection with its products and services, including online through its official website at the domain name <tangleteezer.com> which is nearly identical to the disputed domain name, and, similarly, the identical nature of the dispute domain name and the Complainant's trademark, the Panel finds it highly likely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full awareness of the Complainant's rights.

The Respondent has not provided any evidence to suggest otherwise, nor has it come forward with any legitimate justification for registering a domain name identical to a well-known trademark to which it has no apparent connection. The disputed domain name currently resolves to a parked page devoid of content, but as established in previous UDRP decisions, such passive holding does not prevent a finding of bad faith. In this case, the Panel finds that the reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the absence of any rights or legitimate interests, and the lack of substantive response from the Respondent support a conclusion that the disputed domain name is being passively held in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.3. Furthermore, the Panel notes the Respondent's readiness to "delete" the disputed domain name, once the Complainant proves its trademark rights, which to the Panel suggests an admission by the Respondent that Internet users may be confused as to the origin or affiliation of the website at the disputed domain name.

Moreover, the DNS configuration of the disputed domain name includes active MX records, indicating the potential use of the domain for email communications. This raises serious concerns, as email addresses based on the disputed domain name could mislead recipients into believing they are communicating with the Complainant.

Taking all of the above into account - including the reputation of the Complainant's trademark, the identity of the disputed domain name with the Complainant's trademark, the lack of substantive response, and the potential for misleading email activity - the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied 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 <tangleteezer.pro> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Alissia Shchichka/

Alissia Shchichka

Sole Panelist

Date: August 6, 2025