

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LYMA Life Limited v. Kanhai Paris, LYMA

Case No. D2025-4526

1. The Parties

The Complainant is LYMA Life Limited, United Kingdom, represented by CMS Cameron McKenna Nabarro Olswang LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Kanhai Paris, LYMA, Netherlands (Kingdom of the).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lyma-paris.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 3, 2025. On November 3, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 3, 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 (Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0175358035)¹ and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 5, 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 November 10, 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”).

¹ The Complainant also provided the name and contact details of a company located in Hong Kong, China based on searches of the website at the disputed domain name. However, the Registrar has confirmed that the registrant of the disputed domain name is “Kanhai Paris, LYMA”, and accordingly the Panel formally considers the Registrar-confirmed registrant as the Respondent, notwithstanding that the Hong Kongese company may be a beneficial holder of the disputed domain name.

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on November 14, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 4, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 8, 2025.

The Center appointed Oleksiy Stolyarenko as the sole panelist in this matter on December 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 is a company incorporated in England and Wales on February 10, 2017. The Complainant operates in the wellness and beauty sector and promotes "LYMA" as its brand and trade name. The Complainant has been featured in international media including Forbes, Vogue, and the Financial Times.

The Complainant owns an international portfolio of registered trademarks for LYMA, including, but not limited to the following trademarks:

- United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK00003256862 for LYMA, registered on December 15, 2017 (classes 5).
- United States trademark registration No. 6017790 for LYMA, registered on March 24, 2020 (class 5).
- European Union trademark registration No. 018681389 for LYMA, registered on August 24, 2022 (classes 3, 5, 10).

The Complainant operates the website under the domain name <lyma.life> with the website history going back to 2017. On this website the Complainant actively advertises and sells its products under the LYMA mark.

The disputed domain name was registered on June 27, 2025. According to the available registration data, the disputed domain name is registered using a privacy service (Contact Privacy Inc.) and is configured with Google Domains name servers. At the time of the decision, the disputed domain name resolved to an online shop which prominently used the term "LYMA" and "LYMA PARIS" and offered cosmetic and fragrance-type products for sale. The website also displayed a footer copyright notice "© 2025, LYMA", which reproduced the Complainant's LYMA mark.

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 it has established strong rights in the LYMA mark, which it has used as a trade name since 2017 in connection with its wellness and evidence-based products, and that it has developed a substantial and growing reputation supported by third-party media coverage and evidence of commercial scale.

The Complainant holds numerous trademark registrations for LYMA (and LYMA-formative marks) in multiple jurisdictions, including registered rights predating the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name <lyma-paris.com> is confusingly similar to its LYMA mark because it wholly incorporates LYMA, with only the addition of the geographical term "paris" (and

a hyphen). The Complainant argues that the “.com” generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) is not considered for purposes of assessing confusing similarity and that adding a geographical term does not avoid confusing similarity where the mark remains clearly recognizable.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name on June 27, 2025, well after the Complainant’s adoption and extensive use of LYMA and after the Complainant had secured registered trademark rights, and therefore the Respondent cannot credibly claim any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant asserts that there is no relationship between the Complainant and the Respondent that would authorize the Respondent to use the LYMA mark, and that there is no evidence the Respondent has been commonly known by “LYMA” or by the disputed domain name.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent is not making any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Instead, the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to operate a commercial website that reproduces the LYMA mark and “LYMA PARIS” branding and offers beauty/fragrance-type products for sale, including a “© 2025, LYMA” notice that reproduces the Complainant’s mark. The Complainant contends that this conduct misleads consumers into believing the website is operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant, and thus cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes opportunistic bad faith: the Respondent selected a domain name incorporating the Complainant’s distinctive LYMA mark together with a geographical indicator (“paris”), which the Complainant argues strengthens the false impression of an official local presence or authorized channel. The Complainant alleges that the Respondent’s conduct demonstrates awareness of the Complainant and an intention to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement.

The Complainant submits that given the use and public recognition of the Complainant’s trademarks and their inherent distinctive character, as well as the Respondent’s use of the Complainant’s copyright material, copyright notice, address, email, and product information on the Respondent’s website, it is inconceivable that the Respondent was not aware of the Complainant or its activities when the disputed domain name was registered.

The Complainant also argues that the Respondent’s conduct disrupts the Complainant’s business by imitating the Complainant’s branding and offering overlapping categories of products, and that the Respondent’s overall use of the disputed domain name is fraudulent or at least misleading, supporting a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Accordingly, the Complainant submits that all three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied: the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant’s LYMA mark, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Therefore, the Complainant has met its burden of proof.

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. 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 other terms here, “-paris” 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 gTLD “.com” is viewed as a standard registration requirement and, as such, is disregarded under the first element of the confusing similarity test ([WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1). Therefore, the Panel disregards the gTLD for the purposes of this comparison.

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.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent is not authorized or licensed to use the LYMA trademark in the disputed domain name.

The website under the disputed domain name does offer goods for sale, however, such offering could not be considered as bona fide, because the website fails to accurately disclose the Respondent's relationship with the Complainant.

There is also no evidence suggesting that the Respondent has been known by the name “LYMA”.

Given the composition of the disputed domain name which includes the Complainant's trademark together with the term “-paris”, the Panel struggles to conceive any legitimate interests of the Respondent in the disputed domain name because the disputed domain name effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. See section 2.5.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#). Under such

circumstances, the use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent only increases the possibility of Internet users to falsely attribute the disputed domain name to the activities of the Complainant.

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.

In the present case, the Panel established above that the Complainant has rights in the LYMA trademark and that such trademark rights and use predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The disputed domain name was registered on June 27, 2025, at least seven years after the Complainant adopted and began using LYMA and after the Complainant obtained trademark registrations for LYMA in multiple jurisdictions.

The record shows that the disputed domain name resolved to a commercial website which prominently used "LYMA" and "LYMA PARIS" and offered products for sale. In particular, the screenshots provided in the record show that product pages reproduce "LYMA" / "LYMA PARIS" branding and that the website footer includes a copyright notice "© 2025, LYMA", which reproduces the Complainant's LYMA mark (without any clarifying statement regarding the Respondent's lack of relationship with the Complainant).

In the Panel's view, this use indicates that the Respondent more likely than not had the Complainant and its LYMA mark in mind when registering the disputed domain name, and that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website and the products offered thereon, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Furthermore, the Respondent failed to submit a Response to disprove the Complainant's allegations or to provide any evidence of good faith use or of rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel concludes that the Respondent's intent in registering and using the disputed domain name has more likely than not been to capitalize on the goodwill of the Complainant's LYMA trademark by misleading Internet users into believing that the Respondent's website is operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant.

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 <lyma-paris.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Oleksiy Stolyarenko/
Oleksiy Stolyarenko
Sole Panelist
Date: December 30, 2025