

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Byoma Limited v. mesut erdogan  
Case No. D2025-2800

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Byoma Limited, United Kingdom (“UK”), represented by SafeNames Ltd., UK.

The Respondent is mesut erdogan, Türkiye.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <byomablemish.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 16, 2025. On July 16, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 20, 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, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 21, 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 July 22, 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 July 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 13, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 14, 2025.

The Center appointed Erick Iriarte as the sole panelist in this matter on August 21, 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 Byoma Limited, a skincare brand founded in 2020 in Scotland, UK. BYOMA is one of many skincare brands under the Parent company Future Beauty Labs.

The Complainant is the owner of several BYOMA trademarks in classes 3 and 35 (Annex 8 of the Complaint), including registrations in:

- Australia registration N° 2167020, registered on March 29, 2021,
- UK registration N° UK00003610176, registered on August 6, 2021,
- European Union registration N° 018443892, registered on October 14, 2021, and
- United States of America registration N° 6690108, registered on April 5, 2022.

The Complainant has applied for and is also the owner of the following BYOMA BLEMISH trademarks in classes 3 and 5 (Annex 8 of the Complaint):

- UK registration N° UK00004158214, filed on February 10, 2025, and registered on May 2, 2025,
- United States of America – application N° 99037567, filed on February 11, 2025, and
- European Union registration N° 019142144, filed on February 12, 2025, and registered on July 10, 2025.

The BYOMA BLEMISH trademarks were filed before or at the same time as the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant's official website is "www.byoma.com".

The disputed domain name <byomablemish.com> was registered on February 12, 2025 and it is offered for sale for USD 2,988.

#### **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 encompasses the entirety of the Complainant's BYOMA and BYOMA BLEMISH trademarks. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to redirect to the aftermarket website "www.godaddy.com", where the disputed domain name is listed for sale.

##### **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 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable 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 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 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.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

The Panel finds the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

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 <byomablemish.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Erick Iriarte/*

**Erick Iriarte**

Sole Panelist

Date: September 6, 2025