

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Victoria Beckham v. Tie Bor, hao ming, song lin, d's'da's'da's'd dasd,
KentLorenz MJDNAH, ou oudi
Case No. D2025-3991

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Victoria Beckham, United Kingdom, represented by Com Laude Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondents are d's'da's'da's'd dasd, Armenia, and hao ming, Tie Bor, song lin, KentLorenz MJDNAH, and ou oudi, United States of America.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <halovictoriabeckham.shop>, <holavictoriabeckham-us.shop>, <us-victoriabeckham.shop>, <victoriabeckhambeauty.e.shop>, <victoriabeckhambeautyoff.shop>, and <victoriabeckhambeauty.shop> are registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 30, 2025. On October 1, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On October 2, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondents (Redacted for Privacy Purposes, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 2, 2025 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaints for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on October 7, 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 October 8, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 28, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 29, 2025.

The Center appointed Mihaela Maravela as the sole panelist in this matter on November 4, 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

According to information in the Complaint, the Complainant is a British singer, fashion designer, television personality and a member of Most Excellent Order of the British Empire. The Complainant was in the 1990s a member of the girl group the Spice Girls, which became the best-selling female group of all time with over 100 million records sold worldwide. In 2001 the Complainant released her self-titled debut solo album. The Complainant is also a fashion designer, and in 2008 the Complainant launched her own label. The Complainant's label was named Designer Brand of the Year in the United Kingdom in 2011. In 2024, the label reported revenues of £112.7 million.

The Complainant owns several trademark registrations in many jurisdictions around the world for VICTORIA BECKHAM, including the United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. 902543320, registered on January 22, 2007, in classes 9 and 41, the European Union Trademark Registration No. 002543320, registered on January 22, 2007, in classes 9 and 41, and the International Trademark Registration No. 1163611, registered on June 14, 2012, in classes 3, 9, 14, 18, 24, 25 and 35.

The Complainant maintains an extensive presence online through its websites at "www.victoriabeckham.com" and "www.victoriabeckhambeauty.com" for her fashion and beauty products.

The disputed domain names were registered as follows: the domain name <halovictoriabeckham.shop> on January 12, 2025, the domain name <holavictoriabeckham-us.shop> on February 18, 2025, the domain name <us-victoriabeckham.shop> on June 27, 2025, the domain name <victoriabeckhambeauty.e.shop> on April 14, 2025, the domain name <victoriabeckhambeautyoff.shop> on January 24, 2025 and the domain name <victoriabeckhambeauty.shop> on February 17, 2025. At the date of the Complaint, the disputed domain names resolved to websites that were branded with the Complainant's trademark and purported to offer the Complainant's products for sale, including by use of the Complainant's copyrighted images of its products and did not provide any disclaimer that would accurately disclose the Respondents' lack of relationship with the Complainant. At the date of the Decision, the disputed domain names either resolve to the same website as at the date of the Complaint, or to error messages, or to a third-party shop.

There is no information known about the Respondent apart from the details as they appear on the Whois record.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names only differ from the Complainant's VICTORIA BECKHAM name and marks by the addition of generic and descriptive words, namely "halo", "hola" (Spanish for "hello"), "us", "beauty", "off", and "beauty" followed by "e". In each case, the Complainant contends that the additional adornments do not detract from or mitigate the dominance of the Complainant's mark as the most significant element in each of the disputed domain names. Moreover, the term "beauty" is directly associated with the Complainant's beauty products and even appears in the Complainant's own domain name used to promote genuine goods, thereby heightening the likelihood of confusion.

As regards the second element, the Complainant avers that the Respondent cannot claim a legitimate "fair use" interest as the nature of the disputed domain names carries a risk of implied affiliation. The Complainant is selling fashion and beauty products via her official online shops. The adornments as well as the chosen Top-Level Domain ".shop" are within the Complainant's field of commerce. Thus, the disputed domain names falsely imply an affiliation between the Respondent and the Complainant. Furthermore, the Respondent cannot claim to make any fair use as a reseller, distributor, or service provider of the Complainant's products. More specifically, the Respondent has not received permission or consent from the Complainant to (i) act as an authorized distributor of their goods, including but not limited to VICTORIA BECKHAM products, (ii) use the Complainant's name and mark in the disputed domain names, or to (iii) use her copyrighted product photographs on the associated websites. Even if the Respondent were a genuine reseller of the Complainant's products, which is in any event denied, the Respondent cannot claim nominative fair use as reseller or distributor under the Oki Data test, as the websites do not contain any disclaimers or make clear the relationship (or, more accurately, lack thereof) between the Parties.

In addition, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain names are not used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, rather they are used for impersonation, evidenced by the use of the Complainant's logotype at the top of each website at the disputed domain names, the use of the Complainant's VICTORIA BECKHAM brand and name throughout, the inclusion of product photographs directly copied from the Complainant's official websites, the use of a similar black and white colour scheme, the display of the VICTORIA BECKHAM name in connection with all goods offered, or the partial use of the Complainant's logotype as their favicon. The Complainant therefore contends that the Respondent's purpose is to deceive Internet users into believing that the websites are operated by or associated with the Complainant.

With respect to the third element, the Complainant avers that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's VICTORIA BECKHAM name and mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its websites per Policy para. 4(b)(iv).

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that (i) the disputed domain names were registered with the same Registrar; (ii) the disputed domain names use the same Whois privacy service; (iii) the disputed domain names were registered in a short period of time of each other; (iv) all disputed domain names are registered within the ".shop" Top-Level Domain; (v) the disputed domain names are similar in construction in that they incorporate the Complainant's trademark, with additional terms; (vi) the disputed domain names resolve or resolved to similar websites, effectively impersonating the Complainant and purporting to offer the Complainant's products for sale; (vii) demonstrably false registration information was used for most of the disputed domain names.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party. The Respondents have been given an opportunity to object to consolidation through the submission of pleadings to the Complaint, but have chosen not to try to rebut the consolidation (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 4.11.2).

Based on the Complaint, the Panel finds that it is more likely than not that the disputed domain names are in common control of one entity or person; hence, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

6.2. Substantive Issues

No response has been received from the Respondent in this case. Accordingly, the Panel considers it can proceed to determine the Complaint based on the statements and documents submitted by the Complainant as per paragraph 15(a) of the Rules. The applicable standard of proof in UDRP cases is the "balance of probabilities" or "preponderance of the evidence", and the Panel can draw certain inferences in light of the particular facts and circumstances of the case. See section 4.2 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

To succeed, the Complainant must demonstrate that all of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied: (i) the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights, (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names, and (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that it has rights to a trademark, and that the disputed domain names are identical or confusingly similar to that trademark. This first element under the Policy functions primarily as a standing requirement. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has provided evidence of its rights in the VICTORIA BECKHAM trademark by providing evidence of its trademark registration.

As regards the second limb of the first element, the test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the trademark and the disputed domain names. It is well established that the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) may be ignored when assessing the confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Complainant’s trademarks as they are viewed as a standard registration requirement. See section 1.11.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

The Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, “halo”, “hola”, “us”, “off”, “beauty”, or “beautye” and/or a hyphen) may bear on 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 names 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The disputed domain names resolve or resolved to online retail shops reproducing the Complainant’s VICTORIA BECKHAM trademark and purportedly offering for sale the Complainant’s products. As discussed below, such use does not confer in the Panel’s view rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent.

Under certain circumstances, UDRP panels have recognized that resellers, distributors, or service providers using a domain name containing the complainant's trademark to undertake sales or repairs related to the complainant's goods or services may be making a bona fide offering of goods and services and thus have a legitimate interest in such domain name (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.8.1), if certain requirements are met. As outlined in the "Oki Data test", such requirements normally include the respondent actually be offering the goods or services at issue, the respondent using the site to sell only the trademarked goods or services, the website accurately and prominently disclosing the registrant's relationship with the trademark holder. Also, the respondent must not try to "corner the market" in domain names that reflect the trademark. See *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#). In this case the websites to which the disputed domain names resolve or resolved do not disclose the relationship or lack of relationship with the trademark owner. Therefore, the Panel considers that the above-mentioned criteria are not met in this case and the disputed domain names have not been used for a bona fide offering of goods in the meaning of the Policy.

If the Respondent is not reselling the Complainant's goods, the Panel considers that the Respondent has used the disputed domain names to intentionally attempt to attract, confuse and profit from Internet users seeking the Complainant's goods, likely for some illicit purpose such as phishing, given that the websites at the disputed domain names include or included links to payment details and/or contact forms requiring personal data. Such use of the disputed domain names could not be said to be bona fide.

Further, the composition of the disputed domain names, which combines the Complainant's trademark with a dictionary term referring to the Complainant's products, or geographical terms, suggests an affiliation with the Complainant. UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Also, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain names within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

The Panel considers that the Complainant has made a *prima facie* case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Respondent failed to rebut that *prima facie* case because the Respondent did not respond to the Complainant's contentions.

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.

Under the circumstances of the case, including the composition of the disputed domain names and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, as well as the use of the Complainant's trademark and product images on the websites at the disputed domain names, it can be inferred that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant's trademark when registering the disputed domain names, and that the disputed domain names were registered due to the risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant's trademark.

As regards the use, the disputed domain names direct or directed Internet traffic to websites displaying the VICTORIA BECKHAM trademarks and purportedly offering for sale the Complainant's various products. Therefore, the Panel considers that the Respondent intentionally tried to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation of its websites in accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Not only do the disputed domain names reflect the Complainant's distinctive mark, but the Respondent has used them for websites that effectively impersonate the Complainant including by prominent use of the Complainant's mark/logo as well as by unauthorised use of the Complainant's copyrighted product images and the lack of any prominent disclaimer.

In these circumstances, it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent was intent on commercial gain, whether from resale of the Complainant's products, or from phishing or some other illicit purpose.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed sale of counterfeit goods, 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 names 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 names <halovictoriabeckham.shop>, <holavictoriabeckham-us.shop>, <us-victoriabeckham.shop>, <victoriabeckhambeauty.e.shop>, <victoriabeckhambeautyoff.shop>, and <victoriabeckhambeauty.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mihaela Maravela/
Mihaela Maravela
Sole Panelist
Date: November 10, 2025