

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bubble Beauty, Inc. DBA Bubble Skincare v. 魏建东
Case No. D2025-3677

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Bubble Beauty, Inc. DBA Bubble Skincare, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Meister Seelig & Fein LLP, United States.

The Respondent is 魏建东, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <hellobubblestore.com> is registered with Jiangsu Bangning Science & technology Co. Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 10, 2025. On September 11, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 12, 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 (unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 12, 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 September 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 7, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 8, 2025.

The Center appointed Geert Glas as the sole panelist in this matter on October 10, 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 has been active since 2018 as a global retailer of a line of youth-focused skincare products. Its skincare products are sold online (through its own “Bubble” website as well as other e-commerce channels (such as “www.walmart.com”)) and shipped to customers in around 100 countries as well as by retailers in over 12,000 stores in the United States.

On May 20, 2019, the Complainant’s registered the domain name <hellobubble.com>. The Complainant’s “Bubble” website to which this domain name directs serves as its main channel for its worldwide retail sales of skincare products. The Complainant has also invested heavily in developing a strong online presence by being active on leading social media platforms, such as TikTok, where the Complainant’s official “Bubble” page has 2.7 million followers and YouTube where the Complainant’s videos featuring its skincare products have received more than 70 million views.

In view of the above, the products of the Complainant and the trademarks under which they are commercialised, as listed below, have in the span of a couple of years become widely-known.

The Complainant owns a number of trademark registrations which include:

- United States trademark registration No. 7043262 for BUBBLE SKINCARE, registered on May 2, 2023, in International class 3 and claiming a first use date of April 30, 2022;
- United States trademark registration No. 7610917 for BUBBLE SKINCARE registered on December 17, 2024, in International class 35 and claiming a first use date of November 19, 2020;
- United States trademark registration No. 7899066 for BUBBLE in a jumbled stylized design, registered on August 19, 2025, in International class 3 and claiming a first use date of November 19, 2020.

The Respondent is an individual who is apparently located in China.

The disputed domain name was registered on May 20, 2025. It appears from evidence provided by the Complainant that the disputed domain name resolves to a website which closely resembles the “Bubble” website of the Complainant as illustrated by the very identical landing page, the prominent use of Complainant’s BUBBLE SKINCARE mark and of images of the Complainant’s products as well as a reference to the Complainant in the “Bubble Beauty Inc 2025” copyright notice. Overall, this website also uses a layout and format which closely resembles the ones used on the Complainant’s “Bubble” 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 contends that it enjoys absolute and exclusive rights to its BUBBLE SKINCARE mark of which the dominant “Bubble” feature is recognizable in the disputed domain name which consist of the word “Bubble” surrounded by the words “Hello” and “Store”. As a result, the disputed domain name can be considered confusingly similar to the BUBBLE SKINCARE mark.

The Complainant also points out that the “hellobubble” part of the disputed domain name corresponds to its domain name <hellobubble.com> which it registered in 2019 and uses for its online “Bubble” store. This element as well as the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant with a picture-perfect image of its “Bubble” website clarifies and affirms the confusing similarity between the Complainant’s marks and the disputed domain name.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name as the Respondent has never been authorized to use any of the Complainant's trademarks in any manner and to the best of the Complainant's knowledge the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The Complainant points out that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to resolve to a website purportedly offering for sale skincare products. Such use on a copycat website displaying the Complainant's BUBBLE SKINCARE mark, its pictures and copyright notice, can never confer rights or legitimate interests to the Respondent.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iii) of the Policy. The Respondent is using the disputed domain name to direct Internet users to an imitation website displaying the Complainant trademarks, pictures and copyright notice thus unfairly trading on the goodwill associated with the Complainant's trademarks.

The Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name also constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy as the Respondent has intentionally attracted Internet users for commercial gain, claiming to offer the Complainant's branded skincare products for sale through the Respondent's competing copycat website, creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and its trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, the Complainant argues that its rights in the BUBBLE SKINCARE marks are sufficiently well established, and its branded skincare products have achieved a level of widespread recognition such that the Respondent has no credible argument that he is unaware of the Complainant and its trademarks.

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.

Panels have found that where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, or where at least a dominant feature of the relevant mark is recognizable in the domain name, the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark for purposes of UDRP standing. The Panel considers that the word "bubble" is the dominant element of the Complainant's BUBBLE SKINCARE mark. This same word "bubble" can be found in the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms, here "hello" and "store", may bear on the assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms 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.

In some instances, panels have however taken note of the content of the website associated with a domain name to confirm confusing similarity whereby it appears prima facie that the respondent seeks to target a trademark through the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.15.

The fact that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to direct Internet users to a copycat website displaying the Complainant's BUBBLE SKINCARE mark, images of its products and a reference to the Complainant in its copyright notice does indeed reinforce the conclusion that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's BUBBLE SKINCARE mark.

Based on the available evidence, 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.

There is indeed no evidence in the available record of the Respondent using the disputed domain name with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or the Respondent being commonly known by the disputed domain name, or the Respondent being related to the Complainant's business or somehow authorised by the Complainant to use the disputed domain name or the Respondent making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

To the contrary: the Complainant has provided evidence showing that the disputed domain name resolves to a website which closely resembles the "Bubble" website of the Complainant as illustrated by the prominent use of the Complainant's BUBBLE SKINCARE mark, the use of images of the Complainant's products, of its copyright notice and of a very similar overall layout and format as the ones used on the Complainant's "Bubble" website.

Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of services, nor can it confer rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent.

Moreover, the presence in the disputed domain name of the terms "hello" and "store" and the composition of the disputed domain name which is similar to the Complainant's own domain name <hellobubble.com>, carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant as the use of these terms creates the idea that the disputed domain name refers to a website where Complainant's products can be purchased online and which even is linked to the Complainant whose company name features in the copyright notice.

Based on the available record, 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.

As to the registration of the disputed domain name, it should be noted that panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name which is confusingly similar to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.1.4.

This seems to be the case here, as BUBBLE SKINCARE had become a widely-known trademark by the time the disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent. As a result, the Respondent must have had knowledge of the Complainant's activities and of its BUBBLE SKINCARE mark when registering the disputed domain name. This is also corroborated by the presence in the disputed domain name of the word "hello" which corresponds to the <hellobubble.com> domain name of the Complainant.

The nature and meaning of the added terms "hello" and "store" illustrate the intention of the Respondent, already when registering the disputed domain name, to create an impression of affiliation or at least a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant whose online store uses the domain name <hellobubble.com> and which is well-known for selling skincare products under the BUBBLE SKINCARE mark.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith.

According to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, the following circumstances, if found to be present, shall constitute evidence of the use of a domain name in bad faith: by using the domain name you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product or service on your website or location.

In the present case, the disputed domain name which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's BUBBLE SKINCARE mark, resolves to a website which closely resembles the "Bubble" website of the Complainant as illustrated by the prominent use of the Complainant's BUBBLE SKINCARE mark, the use of images of the Complainant's products, of its copyright notice and of a very similar overall layout and format as the ones used on the Complainant's "Bubble" website. As a result, the disputed domain name seeks to attract Internet users to a commercial website which impersonates the Complainant.

This use clearly constitutes an intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's BUBBLE SKINCARE mark as to the source, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website to which the disputed domain name resolves.

Moreover, the Respondent did not file a response to the Complaint by which these proceedings were initiated. By doing so, the Respondent failed to seize an opportunity it could have used to provide any justification for its use of the disputed domain name.

As a result, and based on the available record, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under the Policy and that the third element 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 <hellobubblestore.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Geert Glas/

Geert Glas

Sole Panelist

Date: October 23, 2025