

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Huda Beauty Limited v. shufang chen  
Case No. D2025-3771

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Huda Beauty Limited, British Virgin Islands, United Kingdom, represented by Rouse Consultancy (Shanghai) Limited, China.

The Respondent is shufang chen, China.

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

The disputed domain name <hudabeautymall.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on September 17, 2025. On September 17, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On the same day, 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 September 17, 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 September 18, 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 September 18, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 8, 2025. The Center received an email reply which appears to be automatically sent from the email address listed on the website at the disputed domain name on September 19, 2025. Accordingly, the Center notified the Parties of the Commencement of Panel Appointment Process on October 13, 2025.

The Center appointed Gabriela Kennedy as the sole panelist in this matter on October 16, 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 was founded in 2013 by the beauty blogger Huda Kattan. The Complainant's first product was a collection of false eyelashes released through Sephora, in Dubai in 2011 and the United States of America in 2015. The Complainant now sells more than 100 different products in over 50 countries and across more than 1,200 retail stores offering an entire range of cosmetics, skincare and fragrance.

The Complainant owns various word and figurative trademarks for the HUDABEAUTY mark in multiple jurisdictions. The relevant trademark registrations include, inter alia, the European Union Trademark Registration No. 015755549 for "HUDABEAUTY" in Classes 3, 9, 35, 41, and 44, registered on December 19, 2016; the United States of America Trademark Registration No. 5459220 for "HUDABEAUTY" in Classes 3 and 35, registered on May 1, 2018; and the Hong Kong, China Trademark Registration No. 306520086 for "hudabeauty" in Classes 3, 9, 16, 18, 21, 25, 35, 41, and 44, registered on April 8, 2024 (the "Complainant's Trademark"). The Complainant also owns the trademark #CYBERCRAZE, for example, the United Arab Emirates Trademark Registration No. 431901 in Class 35, registered on November 19, 2024.

The Complainant also owns the domain name <hudabeauty.com>, registered on April 3, 2010, and has been using it as the official website to promote HUDABEAUTY branded products globally.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on July 17, 2025, many years after the Complainant first registered the Complainant's Trademark. Prior to filing of the Complaint, the Disputed Domain Name purportedly resolved to a website that displayed the Complainant's Trademark and the Complainant's #CYBERCRAZE trademark (without the symbol "#"), included the copyright notice of "© 2025 Huda Beauty" at the bottom of the webpage, and apparently offered for sale HUDABEAUTY branded products. The Complainant instructed an agent to take down the website, however, it was restored by the Respondent under a different website layout. At the time of filing of the Complaint and the rendering of this Decision, the Disputed Domain Name resolved to a website displaying a message stating "BI-ANNUAL SALE UP TO 90% OFF!" and purportedly offering to sell clothing for babies and toddlers (collectively, the "Respondent's 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:

(a) the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's Trademark. The generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) ".com" is a standard registration requirement and should be disregarded in the assessment of confusing similarity under the Policy. The dominant component of the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's Trademark in its entirety with the addition of the term "mall". The mere addition of a generic term such as "mall" here does not prevent the finding of confusing similarity between the Disputed Domain Name and the Complainant's Trademark.

(b) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent's mere registration of the Disputed Domain Name does not create any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant in any way. The Complainant has never authorized or licensed the Respondent to use the Complainant's Trademark in any manner. There is no evidence indicating that the Respondent has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent's use of the Disputed Domain Name cannot be considered as a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use as the Respondent was using the previous version of the Respondent's Website to commit fraudulent activities – there were complaints claiming that some customers ordered products from the Respondent's Website but did not receive the products. The Disputed Domain Name, comprised of the Complainant's Trademark together with the term "mall," is likely to lead Internet users to believe it denotes a mall offering the Complainant's products, thereby creating a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant.

(c) The Respondent has registered the Disputed Domain Name and is using it in bad faith. As the Disputed Domain Name previously displayed the Complainant's Trademark and the Complainant's CYBERCRAZE trademark, as well as the copyright notice of "© 2025 Huda Beauty", such use clearly indicates the Respondent's actual knowledge of the Complainant and the Complainant's Trademark when registering and using the Disputed Domain Name. The Respondent attempts to trade on the goodwill associated with the Complainant's Trademark to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's Website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and the Complainant's Trademark.

## **B. Respondent**

The Center received an email reply which appears to be automatically sent from the email address listed on the Respondent's Website on September 19, 2025 indicating its receipt of the Notification of the Complaint and if the sender had any specific questions to the matter, the sender should provide more details but did not provide any substantive response to address the Complainant's contentions.

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant is required to prove each of the following three elements:

- (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 by the Respondent in bad faith.

### **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 entirety of the Complainant's Trademark is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. Furthermore, the gTLD in this case ".com" may be disregarded for the purposes of assessing confusing similarity under the first element.

Although the addition of other terms (here, “mall”) 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 Complainant’s Trademark 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.

The Panel notes that there is no evidence on the available record to show that the Respondent has trademark rights corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name, or that the Respondent has become commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. The Panel further notes that the Complainant has provided no license or authorization of any kind to the Respondent to use the Complainant’s Trademark or to apply for or use any domain name incorporating the Complainant’s Trademark. The Respondent would likely not have adopted the Complainant’s Trademark if not for the purpose of creating an impression that the Disputed Domain Name is associated with, or originates from the Complainant. The reproduction of the Complainant’s Trademark, with the additional term “mall” in the Disputed Domain Name, as well as the purported use of the Complainant’s Trademark on the Respondent’s Website also leads to a risk of implied affiliation as the Disputed Domain Name effectively impersonates or suggest sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. The Panel also notes a customer report purportedly received by the Dubai Department of Economy and Tourism, alleging that the Respondent’s Website was a scam, including a complaint regarding the non-delivery of products after an order was placed.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here claimed impersonation, passing off or other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

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.

In the present case, the Panel notes that it is difficult to conceive of any plausible use of the Disputed Domain Name by the unaffiliated Respondent that would amount to good faith use, given that the Disputed Domain Name incorporates the Complainant's Trademark in its entirety together with the term "mall", and (according to the Complainant's records) the Respondent's Website has previously displayed the Complainant's Trademark and the Complainant's #CYBERCRAZE trademark (without the symbol "#") and the copyright notice related to the Complainant "© 2025 Huda Beauty". At the time of the rendering of this Decision, the Respondent's Website was also used to advertise children's clothing and invite Internet users to place orders online. The Respondent has registered and used the Disputed Domain Name to mislead and divert Internet users to the Respondent's Website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's Website. Further, the Respondent failed to respond to the Complainant's contentions and has provided no evidence of any actual or contemplated good faith use of the Disputed Domain Name.

Panels have previously held that a finding of bad faith may be established where a complainant's trademark is shown to be well known or in wide use at the time of registration of the disputed domain name (see *LEGO Juris A/S v. store24hour*, WIPO Case No. [D2013-0091](#)). The Respondent must have been aware of the Complainant and the Complainant's Trademark when registering and using the Disputed Domain Name given the well-known nature of the Complainant's Trademark and the fact that it was put into use well before the Respondent registered the Disputed Domain Name. Moreover, according to the records provided by the Complainant, the Respondent's Website used to feature the Complainant's Trademark to create an impression of being a website authorized or endorsed by the Complainant when it is not.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, impersonation, passing off, or other types of fraud constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <hudabeautymall.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Gabriela Kennedy/*

**Gabriela Kennedy**

Sole Panelist

Date: October 31, 2025