

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Point of View, Inc. v. Azeed Hussain  
Case No. D2025-4064

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Point of View, Inc., United States of America (“United States”), represented by Ropes & Gray LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Azeed Hussain, India.

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

The disputed domain name <povbeautyshop.com> is registered with Hostinger Operations, UAB (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 6, 2025. On October 7, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On October 8, 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 October 10, 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 October 15, 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 17, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was November 6, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on November 11, 2025.

The Center appointed Estela Mariel de Luca as the sole panelist in this matter on November 14, 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, Point of View, Inc., is a United States company, specializing in the skincare sector.

The Complainant is the owner of various trademark registrations, including:

- Canadian Trademark Registration No. 1,522,341 for P.O.V., in international classes 3 and 5, registered on February 14, 2013;
- International Trademark Registration No. 1,796,072 for P.O.V. BEAUTY, in international class 3, registered on May 31, 2024;
- International Trademark Registration No. 1,796,074 for POINT OF VIEW, in international class 3, registered on May 31, 2024.

In addition, the Complainant owns the domain name <povbeauty.com>, registered on January 18, 2019.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 7, 2025, and resolves to a website purportedly offering products similar to those of the Complainant.

#### **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 is phonetically confusingly similar to the P.O.V. BEAUTY mark and the domain name <povbeauty.com>; and that the addition of the term “shop” may lead users to assume a commercial association or an official outlet connected with the Complainant.

The Complainant further asserts that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests for the registration and use of the disputed domain name, noting that the Respondent is not a licensee of the Complainant, has not been authorized or otherwise affiliated with the Complainant, and that there is no evidence that the disputed domain name has been used in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has replicated elements associated with the Complainant's website and is using the disputed domain name to sell skin care products, which, according to the Complainant, reflects an intention to take unfair advantage of the goodwill in the Complainant's Marks and to attract consumers for commercial gain.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

##### **B. Respondent**

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

## 6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant carries the burden of proving:

- (i) that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name;
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Respondent's default in the case at hand does not automatically result in a decision in favor of the Complainant, however, paragraph 5(f) of the Rules provides that if the Respondent does not submit a Response, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall decide the dispute based upon the Complaint.

Further, according to paragraph 14(b) of the Rules, the Panel may draw such inferences from the Respondent's failure to submit a Response as it considers appropriate.

### 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 mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of the term "shop" 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 disputed domain name resolves to a website that reproduces the registered trademark POINT OF VIEW in a similar style as in the Complainant's official website while allegedly offering skin care products.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activities – such as impersonation or passing off – can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. See [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel also notes that the composition of the disputed domain name creates a risk of implied affiliation or suggests sponsorship and/or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

Accordingly, the Complainant has provided evidence supporting its *prima facie* claim that the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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 the Respondent, by using the disputed domain name, has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, impersonation / passing off 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 <povbeautyshop.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Estela Mariel de Luca/  
Estela Mariel de Luca  
Sole Panelist  
Date: November 30, 2025*