

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Bubble Beauty, Inc. DBA Bubble Skincare v. Dillon Young, Dillon Young
Case No. D2026-0036

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Bubble Beauty, Inc. DBA Bubble Skincare, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Meister Seelig & Fein PLLC, United States.

The Respondent is Dillon Young, Dillon Young, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <helobubble.com> is registered with Dominet (HK) Limited (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 6, 2026. On January 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 8, 2026, 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 and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 8, 2026, 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 January 8, 2026.

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 January 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was January 29, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 30, 2026.

The Center appointed Angela Fox as the sole panelist in this matter on February 6, 2026. 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 New York-based company and a global retailer of a line of skincare products under the trademark BUBBLE. The BUBBLE skincare line was launched in 2018 and is sold by retailers in over 12,000 stores across the United States, including Target, Walmart, CVS, Ulta Beauty, and their respective e-commerce channels (e.g., “www.walmart.com”) and online internationally through Amazon, Beauty Bay, and the Complainant’s official BUBBLE website at “www.hellobubble.com”, the domain name for which was registered by the Complainant on May 20, 2019 and has been in continuous use since then to market and promote the Complainant’s BUBBLE skincare line.

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registrations, details of which were annexed to the Complaint:

- United States Trademark Registration No. 7610917, BUBBLE SKINCARE, registered on December 17, 2024, for “online retail store services in relation to non-medicated skincare preparations; online retail store services in relation to medicated preparations for skin treatment” in International Class 35, with a first-use date of November 19, 2020;
- United States Trademark Registration No. 7899066, BUBBLE in a jumbled stylized design, registered on August 19, 2025, for “non medicated skin care preparations, namely, facial serums, facial cleansers, facial toners, facial moisturizers, facial treatment masks, makeup remover, salicylic acne cleanser not for medical purposes; kits comprised of non-medicated skin care preparations, namely, facial serums, facial cleansers, facial toners, facial moisturizers, facial treatment masks, makeup remover, salicylic acne cleanser not for medical purposes” in International Class 3, with a first-use date of November 19, 2020; and
- United States Trademark Registration No. 7043262, BUBBLE SKINCARE, registered on May 2, 2023, for “non medicated skin care preparations, namely, facial cleansers, facial toners, facial moisturizers, facial treatment masks; kits comprised of facial cleansers, facial toners, facial moisturizers, and facial treatment masks” in International Class 3, with a first-use date of April 30, 2022.

The Complainant has promoted its BUBBLE and BUBBLE SKINCARE products globally, including on its “www.hellobubble.com” website and social media platforms including TikTok, where the Complainant’s official page has 3.8 million followers and 23.5 million likes, and Instagram with 856,000 followers, as well as YouTube where the Complainant’s videos featuring its skincare products have received over 168,065,308 views and 507,000 subscribers. The Complainant states that its BUBBLE brand has developed considerable reputation and goodwill in the United States and worldwide as a result of these activities.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 21, 2025. At the time of filing the Complaint it was used to host what appears to be a copycat website impersonating the Complainant and offering for sale what purports to be the Complainant’s BUBBLE-branded products at substantial discounts. The Respondent’s landing page to which the disputed domain name resolved, was nearly identical to that of the Complainant and the Respondent’s website imitates the format and layout of the Complainant’s own website at its official website, “www.hellobubble.com”. The Respondent’s website under the disputed domain name featured copies of the Complainant’s digital images of its skincare products, graphics, models and logos, including in favicons, fonts and colored containers and including a copyright notice reading “2025 Bubble Skincare Reserved”.

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 confusingly similar to its registered trademarks BUBBLE and BUBBLE SKINCARE, incorporating the word “buble” which is an obvious misspelling of the Complainant’s trademark BUBBLE. The Complainant also argues that it has acquired a reputation in its domain name <hellobubble.com> and that the disputed domain name is merely a misspelling of that domain name.

The Complainant also submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has never been authorized by the Complainant to use any of the Complainant’s marks. The Respondent’s use does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use because the Respondent has been using the disputed domain name to host a copycat website impersonating the Complainant. The Respondent is not known by the disputed domain name and the Respondent does not have trademark rights in it or any elements of it.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith. The Respondent was clearly aware of and targeting the Complainant because it is using the disputed domain name that is a misspelling of the Complainant’s trademarks and its official domain name <hellobubble.com> to host a copycat website impersonating the Complainant.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions and is in default. No exceptional circumstances explaining the default have been put forward. Therefore, in accordance with paragraphs 14 (a) and (b) of the Rules, the Panel will decide the Complaint and shall draw such inferences as it considers appropriate from the Respondent’s default.

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, a complainant can only succeed in an administrative proceeding under the Policy if the panel finds that:

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

All three elements must be present before a complainant can succeed in an administrative proceeding under the Policy.

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 the trademarks BUBBLE and BUBBLE SKINCARE for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the trademark BUBBLE is recognizable within the disputed domain name as an obvious misspelling of the Complainant’s mark, in which a letter “b” has been omitted. The disputed domain name contains sufficiently recognizable aspects of the BUBBLE mark to signal an intention on the part of the

Respondent to confuse Internet users who are looking for a website of the Complainant. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7 and 1.9.

Although the addition of the term "helo" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, it does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's BUBBLE 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 printouts annexed to the Complaint show that the Respondent has been using the disputed domain name, which is overall a misspelling of the Complainant's official website address at "www.hellobubble.com", to host a fraudulent website offering what purports to be the Complainant's BUBBLE-branded skincare goods for sale at a substantial discount. There is nothing on the record to establish whether the goods are genuine or not or whether an order, if made, would be fulfilled. However, it is clear from the printouts annexed to the Complaint that the website at the disputed domain name has copied the Complainant's logo marks, images and text, and there is nothing to indicate what if any relationship the Respondent has with the Complainant, as required of genuine resellers' websites under *Ok! Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#). Overall, the Respondent's website under the disputed domain name appears to be impersonating the Complainant and is likely to be assumed by visitors to be a genuine website of the Complainant. This impression is likely to be reinforced by the inclusion of the copyright notice reading "2025 Bubble Skincare Reserved". Although the Respondent had the opportunity to respond to the Complaint on this and all other points raised in the Complaint, it did not do so.

Taking all of the foregoing into account, the Panel concludes that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name – and indeed the disputed domain name itself – carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. Impersonation or a false suggestion of a link with a complainant does not constitute fair use under the Policy (see [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1). The Respondent's failure to disclose its lack of a relationship with the Complainant further evidences a lack of any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Impersonation can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent (see [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.

Under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, such circumstances include that by using the domain name, the respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website or location or of a product or service on its website or location.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in connection with a fraudulent website impersonating the Complainant, mimicking the look and feel of the Complainant's own official website and copying the Complainant's logo mark and images from that website. The disputed domain name is not only confusingly similar to the Complainant's BUBBLE trademark but is also confusingly similar to the Complainant's official domain name <hellobubble.com>. It is evident from this that the Respondent was aware of and targeted the Complainant when it registered and used the disputed domain name. The offer of BUBBLE-branded products through the disputed domain name which is intrinsically likely to create the impression of a connection with the Complainant, through a website which impersonates the Complainant, demonstrates that the Respondent was using the disputed domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant.

Panels have also held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity such as impersonation or other types of fraud constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.4.

Taking all of this into account, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered and has used the disputed domain name in bad faith. The Complainant has therefore 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 <helobuble.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Angela Fox/

Angela Fox

Sole Panelist

Date: February 17, 2026