

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Kylie Jenner, Inc. v. Chang-Han Chen
Case No. D2025-3433

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Kylie Jenner, Inc., United States of America ("US"), represented by Studio Barbero S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is Chang-Han Chen, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <kyliekristenjenner.com> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 26, 2025. On August 26, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 26, 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 ("Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC") and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on August 27, 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 the same date.

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 August 29, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 18, 2025. The Response was filed with the Center on September 18, 2025.

The Center appointed Vincent Denoyelle as the sole panelist in this matter on September 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 US headquartered cosmetics company.

The Complainant owns the following KYLIE JENNER trade marks:

- International Trade Mark registration No. 1515798 for KYLIE JENNER registered on July 31, 2019; and
- European Union Trade Mark registration No. 017002891 for KYLIE JENNER, filed on July 19, 2017, and registered on November 3, 2017.

The Complainant also owns the International Trade Mark registration No. 1366642 for KYLIE registered on August 7, 2017.

The disputed domain name was registered on February 6, 2025, and it points to a Registrar page stating that the disputed domain name is for sale and specifying a price of USD 1,200,000.

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 addition of the term "kristen" between the first and second parts of the KYLIE JENNER trade mark is not sufficient to prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trade mark.

The Complainant states that the Respondent is not a licensee or an authorized agent of the Complainant and that the Respondent is not otherwise authorized to use the Complainant's trade mark. The Complainant asserts that it is not aware of any circumstances that would suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant points out that there is no evidence of (i) use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services before any notice of the dispute or (ii) a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the Complainant's trade mark. The Complainant points to the fact that the disputed domain name is being offered for sale for an amount far in excess of reasonable out-of-pocket costs.

Turning to the registration and use of the disputed domain name in bad faith, the Complainant argues that the Respondent would have undoubtedly been aware of the Complainant and its trade mark at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant initially instructed a web agency to contact Respondent to verify its real intentions as to the disputed domain name and acquire information on any possible legitimate interest related to it. In its response to the Complainant, the web agency admitted awareness of Complainant's rights in its famous trademarks and indicated "This name is directly associated with Kylie Jenner, a globally recognized billionaire and the driving force behind a multi-billion-dollar beauty empire. Its branding potential, media relevance, and cultural impact make it a highly valuable and rare digital asset". The Complainant considers that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling it to the Complainant for valuable consideration in excess of the Respondent's

documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name. The Complainant also points to a potential involvement of the Respondent in a previous case under the Policy, where a transfer was ordered against the respondent in the case in question.

B. Respondent

The Respondent responded to the Complainant essentially arguing that:

- The addition of the word “kristen” between the two parts of the Complainant’s trade mark means that the disputed domain name is not confusingly similar to the Complainant’s KYLIE JENNER trade mark;
- The disputed domain name was not registered nor is it used in bad faith, and the Respondent has no responsibility in the disputed domain name being offered for sale; and
- The disputed domain name could have been registered by the Complainant when it was available.

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 trade mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the KYLIE trade mark is reproduced and the KYLIE JENNER trade mark remains recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the KYLIE and KYLIE JENNER trade marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here, “kristen” between the first and second part of the KYLIE JENNER trade mark, may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

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, in the circumstances of this case, that by offering the disputed domain name for sale, the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of it.

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 finds that the Respondent, at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, must have been aware of the Complainant's trade mark KYLIE JENNER reproduced in the disputed domain name given: (i) the reputation of the KYLIE JENNER trade mark; (ii) the choice of term added between the two parts of the KYLIE JENNER trade mark which corresponds to the middle name of the Complainant's founder; (iii) the fact that the disputed domain name was registered relatively recently and many years after the registration and notoriety of the trade mark KYLIE JENNER, and; (iv) the fact that in its emails to the Complainant's agent (Annex 8 to the Complaint), a third party seemingly acting on behalf of the Respondent has stated very clearly that the disputed domain name was targeting the Complainant.

Turning to bad faith use, the Panel finds that this case falls squarely within paragraph 4(b)(i) of the Policy namely that there are circumstances clearly indicating that the Respondent has registered or acquired the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the disputed domain name registration to the Complainant for valuable consideration in excess of documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the disputed domain name. The Panel's findings are based on the overall circumstances of the case including: (i) the Respondent's knowledge of the Complainant's rights as stated in emails emanating from the Respondent; (ii) the composition of the disputed domain name, and; (iii) the distinctiveness of the Complainant's trade mark.

As for the Respondent's claim that it is not responsible for any offer made to sell the disputed domain name, such is not supported by the evidence in the file and, even if it had been automatically generated, this would not in itself prevent a finding of bad faith. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.5.

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 <kyliekristenjenners.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Vincent Denoyelle/

Vincent Denoyelle

Sole Panelist

Date: October 7, 2025