

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

The Gillette Company v. Idah Idah

Case No. D2025-2752

1. The Parties

The Complainant is The Gillette Company, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Studio Barbero S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is Idah Idah, Indonesia.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <gillette.com> is registered with Key-Systems GmbH (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 11, 2025. On July 14, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 15, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 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 amendment to the Complaint on July 16, 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 paragraphs 2 and 4 of the Rules, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 21, 2025. In accordance with paragraph 5 of the Rules, the due date for Response was August 10, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 11, 2025.

The Center appointed Yuji Yamaguchi as the sole panelist in this matter on August 19, 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 paragraph 7 of the Rules.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant's origin dates back to 1895 when King C. Gillette envisioned the need of an inexpensive new safety razor with disposable blade to replace the unhandy knife-like straight edged razors in use at that time for shaving. In 1901, Mr. Gillette founded the American Safety Razor Company, renamed the following year as Gillette Safety Razor Company, and began the production processes of the safety razors early in 1903. The GILLETTE mark was first registered in the United States in 1905 and since then has been registered as a trademark all over the world. Over the years, starting from the 1950s, the Complainant has pursued a diversification policy expanding its business as well in market sectors other than men's personal grooming products. By acquiring other companies, the Complainant achieved a top position worldwide in home appliance manufacturers (with Braun AG's acquisition in 1967 whose production focused on categories such as shaving and grooming, beauty and hair care, household small appliances, health and wellness, clocks and watches), toothbrushes and other oral care products (with the Oral-B brand acquired in 1984), and alkaline batteries (with Duracell brand acquired in 1996). Besides expanding in other sectors with new brands, the Complainant also diversified the products marketed under the trademark GILLETTE by launching in the 1990s the Gillette Series line of men's toiletries, which included 14 "high-performance" products in the deodorant/antiperspirant, shaving cream, and aftershave categories, and by developing new types of razors. The Complainant was acquired by "The Procter & Gamble Company" in 2005.

The Complainant, since its origins, expanded the sales abroad, with the first foreign sales branch established in London already in 1905. The Complainant is the owner of thousands of the registered national and international trademarks for GILLETTE (the "GILLETTE Trademark") worldwide, including International Trademark Registrations No. 1462003 (registered on March 8, 2019) and No. 1488321 (registered on March 8, 2019), European Union Trademark Registration No. 006665319 (registered on November 18, 2008), United States Trademark Registrations No. 767865 (registered on April 7, 1964) and No. 3547795 (registered on December 16, 2008) and Indonesian Trademark Registration No. IDM000842018 (registered on April 6, 2021). The GILLETTE Trademark has been used in many countries for over 100 years in connection with the production and commercialization of shaving facilities. Nowadays Gillette products are sold in more than 200 countries and territories, including in Indonesia.

The Complainant registered the GILLETTE Trademark and variations thereof as domain names in numerous generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") and country code Top-Level Domains ("ccTLDs"), including <gillette.com>, registered on August 29, 1994, and <gillette.co.uk>, registered on March 8, 2004, in the name of the Complainant's parent company.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 27, 2024, and was redirected to the Complainant's official United Kingdom ("UK") website on May 9, 2025, but has been deactivated and, consequently, does not resolve to an active website.

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's contentions may be summarized as follows:

The disputed domain name incorporates the whole of the Complainant's GILLETTE Trademark. The fact that the disputed domain name differs from the Complainant's GILLETTE Trademark by the mere addition of a letter "l" does not affect the confusing similarity.

The Respondent is not an employee, licensee, affiliated person, authorized agent or reseller of the Complainant or in any other way authorized to use the Complainant's GILLETTE Trademark and has not been authorized to register and use the disputed domain name. The Complainant is not in possession of, nor aware of the existence of any evidence demonstrating that the Respondent might be commonly known by a name corresponding to the disputed domain name as an individual, business, or other organization. It is clear that the Respondent cannot reasonably claim to be commonly known by the disputed domain name. Furthermore, the Respondent has not provided the Complainant with any evidence of use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services before or after any notice of the dispute.

Since the GILLETTE Trademark is well-known worldwide and has been used extensively since 1905, the Respondent could not ignore the existence of the Complainant's GILLETTE Trademark when it registered the disputed domain name. Therefore, the Respondent knew or should have been aware of the Complainant's GILLETTE Trademark rights at the time of the registration of the disputed domain name. Its redirection to the Complainant's official UK website was clearly aimed at inducing users to believe that the disputed domain name was owned and used by the Complainant or one of its affiliated entities. Such conduct clearly demonstrates that the sole purpose of the Respondent was and is to take advantage of the Complainant's reputation and of the well-known character of its GILLETTE Trademark, by causing an erroneous association with the Complainant, its activities and products.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must assert and prove the following three elements are present:

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

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy 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 GILLETTE Trademark and the disputed domain name. See section 1.7 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)").

The disputed domain name consists of the misspelled version of the Complainant's GILLETTE Trademark by the insertion of an additional letter "l" plus the gTLD ".com".

As stated in section 1.9 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), a domain name which consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of a trademark is considered to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. The addition of an extra letter "l" does not

prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's mark for the purposes of the first element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. This stems from the fact that the disputed domain name contains sufficiently recognizable aspects of the GILLETTE Trademark.

Further, the applicable gTLD in a domain name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded for assessing the confusing similarity under the first element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. See section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

Thus, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's GILLETTE Trademark and the first element in paragraph 4(a) 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.

As the Complainant asserts, the Respondent is not an employee, licensee, affiliated person, authorized agent or reseller of the Complainant or in any other way authorized to use the Complainant's GILLETTE Trademark and has not been authorized to register and use the disputed domain name. There is no evidence to show that the Respondent has been commonly known by a name corresponding to the disputed domain name as an individual, business, or other organization pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy and that the Respondent uses or prepares to use the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy.

Although the overall burden of proof in the proceedings is on the complainant, where a complainant makes out a *prima facie* case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on the second element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy 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 in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. See section 2.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

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.

Consequently, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name and the second element in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Since the Complainant's GILLETTE Trademark is well-known (see *Procter & Gamble Business Services Canada Company, The Gillette Company LLC, Braun GmbH and The Procter & Gamble company v. Whois privacy protection service, Internet Invest, Ltd. dba Imena.ua / Artem Shostak, Private person 66478, Whois privacy protection service, Internet Invest, Ltd. dba Imena.ua / Artem Shostak, Private person 53397, Privacy Protection, HOSTING UKRAINE LTD / Коваленко Валерий/Konovalenko Valeriy, Privacy Protection, HOSTING UKRAINE LLC / Коваленко Валерий/Konovalenko Valeriy*, WIPO Case No. [D2017-1493](#)) and the disputed domain name, which is a clear misspelling of the Complainant's GILLETTE Trademark and main domain name <gillette.com>, was registered by the Respondent and was redirected to the Complainant's official UK website, the Respondent must have known the GILLETTE Trademark at the time of the registration and use of the disputed domain name. See section 3.2.2 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#). Such redirection by the Respondent clearly generated the false impression that the disputed domain name was under control of the Complainant or one of its affiliates.

As noted in section 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. Moreover, the Respondent's redirecting the disputed domain name to the Complainant's website establishes bad faith insofar as the Respondent retains control over the redirection thus creating a real or implied ongoing threat to the Complainant.

According to the Complainant's assertion, on May 9, 2025, the Complainant's representative sent to the Respondent's email address indicated in the Whois records and via the Registrar's online contact form a cease and desist letter demanding to avoid any use of the disputed domain name and immediately transfer it to the Complainant for free. The Respondent did not provide any answer, but the disputed domain name was deactivated and does not resolve to an active website following the sending of the cease and desist letter to the Respondent by the Complainant's representative. Such absence of a reply may be further evidence of bad faith.

As to the circumstance that the disputed domain name is not currently redirected to an active website as a result of the Complainant's cease and desist letter, the Respondent's current passive holding of the disputed domain name is also considered to be made in bad faith, considering *inter alia* the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's GILLETTE Trademark, the failure of the Respondent to reply to the Complainant's cease and desist letter or to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, and the composition of the disputed domain name (a clear misspelling of the Complainant's GILLETTE Trademark and domain name <gillette.com>). See section 3.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

The Respondent has also engaged in a pattern of conduct of registering typo-squatted domain names in order to prevent the owners of the trademarks or service marks from reflecting the marks in corresponding domain names according to paragraph 4(b)(ii) of the Policy (see *Groupe VYV v. Idah Idah*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-1652](#); and *American Airlines, Inc. v. Idah Idah*, WIPO Case No. [D2023-3600](#)). See section 3.1.2 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

In light of the above, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith and the third element in paragraph 4(a) 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 name <gilllette.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Yuji Yamaguchi/
Yuji Yamaguchi
Sole Panelist
Date: September 2, 2025