

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Revlon Consumer Products LLC v. Ahmad Awais
Case No. D2025-4715

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Revlon Consumer Products LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Dorsey & Whitney, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Ahmad Awais, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <shinerevlon.com> is registered with CloudFlare, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on November 13, 2025. On November 14, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On November 17, 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 (DATA REDACTED) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on November 18, 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 21, 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 November 26, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due

date for Response was December 16, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on December 18, 2025.

The Center appointed Delia-Mihaela Belciu as the sole panelist in this matter on December 24, 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 has manufactured, marketed, and sold beauty products under the denomination Revlon since 1932. In 2021, the Complainant had nearly USD 2.1 billion in net sales across its portfolio of brands worldwide.

The Complainant sells products in more than 150 countries through wholly-owned subsidiaries and a large number of distributors and licensees. In addition, the Complainant's licensed products include electric hair appliances, such as hair dryers, hair straighteners, and curling irons.

The Complainant was frequently referenced in news, financial and business publications and websites, and has spent hundreds of millions of dollars over several decades advertising and promoting its products on television, in print, on point-of-sale materials, on the Internet, and on social media. The Complainant's first print advertisement outside of trade journals appeared in 1935 in the magazine The New Yorker.

The Complainant claims that it pioneered the use of celebrities in advertising, featuring prominent actors, singers, and models.

The Complainant is the owner of a large number of trademark registrations worldwide, consisting of the denomination REVLON, among which:

- the United States national trademark No. 3035671 for REVLON, registered on December 27, 2005, for goods in class 3;
- the United States national trademark No. 1886476 for REVLON, registered on March 28, 1995, for goods in classes 9 and 11;
- Pakistan national trademark No. 117180 for REVLON, registered on September 23, 1992, for goods in class 26.

In addition, the Complainant owns a large portfolio of domain names that incorporate the REVLON trademark and variations therefore, among which, the domain name <revlon.com> registered on February 2, 1994, used by the Complainant in order to promote its goods.

Moreover, the Complainant maintains social media accounts under the Revlon name, including on Facebook, Instagram, X (formerly Twitter), Pinterest and YouTube.

The disputed domain name <shinerevlon.com> was registered on March 3, 2025. According to the evidence filed by the Complainant, the disputed domain name resolves to an active website which features REVLON branded hair colouring products available for purchase, while the website also contains unauthorized copies of the Complainant's copyrighted images of its brand ambassadors for REVLON branded products.

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:

(i) the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the its REVLON mark as it contains the REVLON mark in its entirety, with the addition in front of it of the descriptive term "shine", term commonly used in the beauty industry, which is not sufficient to escape the finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the its mark REVLON. The Complainant also sustained that its REVLON mark is a famous and a distinctive trademark, being one of the world's best-known names in cosmetics and beauty care products;

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name for a number of reasons, among which that, (1) the Respondent has no relationship with the Complainant and the Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use the REVLON trademark in the disputed domain name, (2) the Complainant's registrations and use of the REVLON trademark pre-date the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name by many decades, (3) the Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain name, (4) given the distinctiveness and the international reputation of the REVLON trademark, the Respondent cannot have legitimate rights in relation to the disputed domain name, (5) the Respondent is using the Complainant's REVLON trademark and the disputed domain name to capitalize on the good will of the Complainant's REVLON trademark misleadingly diverting consumers with intent for commercial gain;

(iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith for a number of reasons, among which that, (1) the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's REVLON trademark, (2) the disputed domain name resolves to an active website which features counterfeit REVLON branded hair colouring products available for purchase, while the website also contains unauthorized copies of the Complainant's copyrighted images of its brand ambassadors for REVLON branded products.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In order for the Complainant to succeed, such must prove, according to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, that:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name; and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

In case all three elements above have been fulfilled, the Panel is able to grant the remedy requested by the Complainant. Thus, the Panel will deal with each of the requirements in turn.

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 Panel finds that the entirety of REVLON mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name with the addition in front of it of the descriptive term "shine", term commonly used in the beauty industry, which does not prevent a finding that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's REVLON mark. 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, in this case "shine", 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.

In what concerns the addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" in relation to the disputed domain name, such is viewed as a standard registration requirement, and is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.11.1.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that 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.

Thus, based on the available evidence, the Respondent does not appear to be commonly known by the name "Revlon".

The Respondent is not a licensee of, nor has any kind of business relationship with the Complainant. The Complainant has never authorised the Respondent to make use of its REVLON trademark in the disputed domain name.

Based on the available evidence, the disputed domain name resolves to an active website which features REVLON branded hair colouring products available for purchase, the website containing also unauthorized

copies of the Complainant's copyrighted images of its brand ambassadors for REVLON branded products, with no disclaimers as to the lack of any relationship with the Complainant, which suggests that the Respondent intended to attract Internet users to a false website looking like an official website of the Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for an illegitimate activity, as in this case impersonation/passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1.

Furthermore, the composition of the disputed domain name, incorporating the Complainant's REVLON mark in its entirety in combination with the descriptive term "shine" in front of it, term commonly used in the beauty industry, might lead to confusion for Internet users as such, carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1.

The above does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services, or to a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Based on the available record, 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 Complainant's rights in the REVLON mark predate the registration date of the disputed domain name.

In light of the above as well as of the high distinctive character of the REVLON mark, the Panel finds that it is not conceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's REVLON mark, which supports a finding of bad faith registration. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2.

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 notes that, the disputed domain name incorporates in its entirety the Complainant's distinctive REVLON mark in its entirety in combination with the descriptive term "shine" in front of it, term commonly used in the beauty industry, while the disputed domain name resolves to an active website, which features REVLON branded hair colouring products available for purchase, the website containing also unauthorized copies of the Complainant's copyrighted images of its brand ambassadors for REVLON branded products, with no disclaimers as to the lack of any relationship with the Complainant, which suggests that the Respondent intended to attract Internet users to a false website looking like an official website of the Complainant by intentionally creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's REVLON trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website and the goods offered and promoted through said website, aspects which support a finding of bad faith registration and use according to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 3.1.4.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for an illegitimate activity, as in this case 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 and 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 <shinerevlon.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Delia-Mihaela Belciu/

Delia-Mihaela Belciu

Sole Panelist

Date: January 7, 2026