

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Huda Beauty Limited v. no lar frank
Case No. D2025-4181

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is no lar frank, Philippines.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <hudabeautys.com> is registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on October 13, 2025. On October 13, 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 (unknown / See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on October 15, 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 16, 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 7, 2025.

The Center appointed Colin T. O'Brien as the sole panelist in this matter on November 11, 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

Founded in 2013, the Complainant offers its cosmetics products under its HUDABEAUTY trademark. The Complainant sells more than 100 products in over 50 countries and more than 1,200 retail stores offering an entire range of cosmetics, skincare and fragrance.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for its HUDABEAUTY mark including:

Australia trademark HUDABEAUTY reg. No.1806380, registered on November 1, 2016.

European Union trademark HUDABEAUTY reg. No.015755549, registered on December 19, 2016.

Singapore trademark HUDABEAUTY reg. No. 40201702888R, registered on June 21, 2017.

United Kingdom trademark HUDABEAUTY reg. No. UK00003200733 registered on March 3, 2017.

The Complainant registered the <hudabeauty.com> domain name on April 3, 2010, and has been using it as official website since then for HUDABEAUTY business.

The Disputed Domain Name <hudabeautys.com> was registered on August 7, 2025. It previously resolved to a website displaying the Complainant's trademark and purportedly offering the Complainant's cosmetic products. It currently resolves to an inactive webpage.

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.

The Complainant has numerous HUDABEAUTY trademark registrations in various countries and regions, which far predate the registration date of the Disputed Domain Name (August 6, 2025). The Complainant thus possesses prior rights in the HUDABEAUTY trademark.

The generic Top-Level Domain ".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 is "hudabeautys", which incorporates the Complainant's HUDABEAUTY trademark in its entirety and the letter "s". It is long-established in UDRP precedents that mere addition of a letter such as "s" does not prevent the Disputed Domain Name from being confusingly similar to the Complainant's HUDABEAUTY trademark.

To the best knowledge of the Complainant, the Respondent does not have any trademark rights corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name (Annex 16). 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 HUDABEAUTY trademark in any manner, including registering domain names incorporating the famous HUDABEAUTY trademark. There is no evidence indicating that the Respondent has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. Whols information further supports a finding that the Respondent is not commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name, especially where a privacy service has been engaged by the Respondent.

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. The Disputed Domain Name currently resolves to an invalid web page. However, the Disputed Domain Name previously resolved to a website prominently displaying the Complainant's HUDABEAUTY trademark, and the website label itself as "Huda Beauty Official Store" as the page title, and purportedly offering the Complainant's HUDABEAUTY cosmetic products, WISHFUL skincare products and its successor in title's KAYALI perfumes. The Respondent's previous use of the Disputed Domain Name was attempting to give the impression that it is an official or authorized website of the Complainant. However, the Complainant has never authorized the Respondent to use the HUDABEAUTY trademark to register domain names and operate websites. Therefore, the Complainant finds that it is reasonable to infer that the Respondent previously used the Disputed Domain Name to conduct fraudulent activities and did not actually supply any HUDABEAUTY products or was supplying counterfeit HUDABEAUTY products. Such use of the Disputed Domain Name by the Respondent has never been considered by previous panels in any types of domain name disputes as bona fide offering of goods or service, or legitimate noncommercial or fair use without intent for noncommercial gain.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Complainant has demonstrated it owns long-standing globally registered trademark rights in the HUDABEAUTY mark. The Disputed Domain Name incorporates a misspelling of the HUDABEAUTY mark, namely with the addition of the letter "s" which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the marks and the Disputed Domain Name. See sections 1.7 and 1.9 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition (["WIPO Overview 3.0"](#)).

Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to marks in which the Complainant has rights.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant has presented a prima facie case that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name and has not been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name. The fact that the Respondent obtained the Disputed Domain Name years after the Complainant had begun using its globally famous HUDABEAUTY mark indicates that the Respondent sought to piggyback on the mark for illegitimate reasons.

After a complainant has made a prima facie case, the burden of production shifts to a respondent to present evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. See, e.g., *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd.*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0455](#).

The Respondent has provided no evidence of any rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. Furthermore, the nature of the Disputed Domain Name, comprising the Complainant's mark and with a misspelling, indicates an awareness of the Complainant and its marks and intent to take unfair advantage of such, which does not support the finding of any rights or legitimate interests.

In the absence of any evidence rebutting Complainant's prima facie case indicating Respondent's lack of rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Disputed Domain Name was registered many years after the Complainant first registered and used its globally famous HUDABEAUTY mark. Considering the evidence on the record provided by the Complainant with respect to the extent of use of its globally known HUDABEAUTY mark, the typosquatting of the Complainant's mark in the Disputed Domain Name, combined with the absence of any evidence provided by the Respondent to the contrary, it is sufficient to satisfy the Panel that, at the time the Disputed Domain Name was registered, the Respondent undoubtedly knew of the Complainant's its globally known HUDABEAUTY mark, and knew that he had no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name. Prior UDRP panels have held that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos) to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. See section 3.1.4 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

There is no benign reason for the Respondent to have registered the Disputed Domain Name.

The Panel finds that the only plausible basis for registering and passively holding the Disputed Domain Name is for illegitimate and bad faith purposes. In view of section 3.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), given the above considerations and especially the nature of the Disputed Domain Name consisting of a misspelling of Complainant's mark, the Panel finds that the totality of the circumstances supports a finding of bad faith, regardless of the current inactive state of the Disputed Domain Name.

Furthermore, the Complainant provided evidence on record that Respondent had previously attempted to give the impression that it was an official or authorized website of the Complainant, which is evidence of bad faith.

Given these circumstances, the Panel finds the requirement of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy that the Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith by the Respondent is met.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <hudabeautys.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Colin T. O'Brien/

Colin T. O'Brien

Sole Panelist

Date: November 26, 2025.