

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Huda Beauty Limited v. projectlookfantastic Smith
Case No. D2025-4182

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is projectlookfantastic Smith, United Kingdom.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <hudabeautyuk.com> is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (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 October 13, 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY) 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 Complainant forwarded to the Center a message that purported to be an email dated October 16, 2025 from the Respondent to the Center which had come into the Complainant's hands. The said message acknowledged receipt of a notice from the Center together with an amended Complaint.

The Center appointed Jane Lambert as the sole panelist in this matter on November 18, 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 award-winning beauty blogger Huda Kattan. Time listed her among The 25 Most Influential People on the Internet in 2017. Forbes ranked her among The Top Beauty Influencers of 2017, The Top Creators of 2022, The Middle East's 100 Most Powerful Businesswomen of 2024 and America's Richest Self-Made Women of 2023.

Beginning as a blog in 2010, Huda Beauty is one of the world's fastest-growing beauty brands. It has over 57 million Instagram followers, 7.7 million Facebook followers, and 4.17 million YouTube followers. In 2024 the Complainant was named as the most popular beauty brand for the first quarter of the year by Cosmetics Business. Such nomination was based on a data-driven analysis that combines Google search volume, average engagement rates and total social following.

The first Huda Kattan product was a collection of false eyelashes which were released through Sephora, in Dubai in 2011 and launched in the United States in 2015. The Complainant now 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 markets and supplies its cosmetics products under the HUDABEAUTY trademark which it has registered in many countries and regions around the world including the following:

Jurisdiction	Number	Registration Date
European Union	015755549	December 19, 2016
United Kingdom	UK00003200733	March 3, 2017
United States of America	5459220	May 1, 2018

The Complainant registered the domain name <hudabeauty.com> on April 3, 2010, and has been using it as the URL for its official website at <hudabeauty.com> for its cosmetics business ever since.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 7, 2025. The Respondent has used the disputed domain name as the URL for a site at "www.hudabeautyuk.com" for the sale of cosmetics, skin care products and fragrances. That site reproduces the Complainant's HUBABEAUTY mark and photographs of its products. It also imitates the colour scheme, lettering and other features of the Complainant's official site at the domain name <hudabeauty.com>.

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.

First, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which it has rights. It has registered the word HUDABEAUTY as a trademark in many countries including those mentioned above. The disputed domain name incorporates the trademark in its entirety. The only difference

is the addition of the abbreviation “uk” for the United Kingdom. The Complainant submits that it is long established in UDRP precedents that the mere addition of an abbreviation such as “uk” does not prevent a disputed domain name from being confusingly similar to a complainant’s trademark. Citing *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#) and *eAuto, L.L.C. v. Triple S. Auto Parts d/b/a Kung Fu Yea Enterprises, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0047](#) the Complainant concludes that the incorporation of the trademark in its entirety into the disputed domain name is enough to establish confusing similarity for the purpose of the Policy.

Second, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. Referring to *Potomac Mills Limited Partnership v. Gambit Capital Management*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-0062](#), it observes mere registration does not create any rights or legitimate interests in a domain name. It notes that the Respondent therefore does not automatically acquire any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name as a result of his registration activity.

To the best of the Complainant’s knowledge, the Respondent does not have any trademark rights corresponding to the disputed domain name, he is not sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant in any way and the Complainant has never authorized or licensed the Respondent to use the HUDABEAUTY trademark in any manner, including registering domain names incorporating the HUDABEAUTY trademark or setting up and operating bogus websites.

The Complainant has found no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Referring to *Croatia Airlines d.d. v. Modern Empire Internet Ltd*, WIPO Case No. [D2003-0455](#), the Complainant contends that it has established a prima facie case that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The evidential burden passed to the Respondent to rebut the Complainant’s contentions which it has failed to do.

Third, the Complainant submits that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Its starting point is that it registered the HUDABEAUTY trademark long before the Respondent registered the disputed domain name. As a result of its sales and advertising the Complainant contends that its mark is very well known. It notes that a simple search of that mark or even the disputed domain name on Google or some other search engine would have shown that the mark belonged to the Complainant. It would also have revealed the mark’s connection with the Complainant’s founder. The Complainant argues that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name as the URL for the bogus website described above shows that the Respondent was well aware of the Complainant’s business and its trademark when he registered the disputed domain name.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name creates a false impression of affiliation with the Complainant and disrupts its business. It contends that such behavior is of itself indicative of bad faith registration and use. In its submission, the Respondent is intentionally attempting to trade on the goodwill associated with HUDABEAUTY trademark in which the Complainant has rights and to attract for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant and the HUDABEAUTY trademark.

In support of that submission, the Complainant relies on the following passage from the panel’s decision in *Huda Beauty Limited v. mao xuan*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-1194](#)

“In the present case, the Respondent created a website that advertises the Complainant’s products, uses the Complainant’s logo and discusses the Complainant’s founder. Clearly, the Respondent was aware of the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name. The use of disputed domain name containing the Complainant’s trademark to attract traffic to a website with banners advertising a range of goods and services, and Google AdSense links from such banners to third-party websites, is evidence of bad faith

registration and use under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. Moreover, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity (here, impersonation) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4. *Regent Bank v. Trey Fisher*, WIPO Case No. [D2024-2995](#).

The Complainant also refers to other cases to support its claims.

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.

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

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed as 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.

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 finds that paragraph 4(b)(iv) applies in that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name (which has been held to be confusingly similar to the Complainant's trade mark) as the URL for the aforementioned bogus website to sell cosmetics, skincare products and fragrances from which the Respondent would expect to derive commercial gain.

Further, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed as 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 <hudabeautyuk.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jane Lambert/

Jane Lambert

Sole Panelist

Date: November 28, 2025