

## ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

CLARINS v. Gina Yu  
Case No. D2026-0060

### 1. The Parties

The Complainant is CLARINS, France, represented by Tmark Conseils, France.

The Respondent is Gina Yu, China.

### 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <clarins.online> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the “Registrar”).

### 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on January 8, 2026. On January 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On January 9, 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 (“Registration Private, Domains By Proxy, LLC”) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 12, 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 15, 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 16, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 5, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on February 6, 2026.

The Center appointed Kathryn Lee as the sole panelist in this matter on February 11, 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 luxury skincare and cosmetics company founded in Paris, France in 1954. The Complainant sells its products in high-end department stores and retailers in over 150 countries and has 8,500 employees worldwide. The Complainant owns a number of trademark registrations for CLARINS including French Trademark Registration Number 1637194 registered on January 7, 1991, European Union Trademark Registration Number 005394283 registered on October 5, 2010, and Chinese Trademark Registration Number 13926490 registered on August 21, 2015. The Complainant uses the domain name <clarins.com>, registered on March 16, 1997, for its official website.

According to information disclosed by the Registrar, the Respondent appears to be an individual with an address in China.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 28, 2025, and redirects to the Registrar landing page advertising the disputed domain name for purchase for 1,488 USD or lease to own for 248 USD per month.

#### **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 identical to the CLARINS mark in which it has rights.

The Complainant also contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and confirms that it has not authorized or licensed rights to the Respondent in any respect. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent's offer to sell the disputed domain name is not considered to be a bona fide offering of goods or services, and that the composition of the disputed domain name creates a strong risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. The Complainant also contends that the disputed domain name was configured for email servers which suggests that the Respondent is attempting to impersonate the Complainant by sending emails from the "@clarins.online" extension.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant contends that CLARINS is a distinctive and famous mark of the Complainant and that there can be no legitimate reason to register the disputed domain name other than to act in bad faith by intentionally seeking to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the website at the disputed domain name. Further, the Complainant contends that the offer for sale of the disputed domain name demonstrates that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling it for a profit. The Complainant also contends that the Respondent's configuration of email servers for the dispute domain name and use of a privacy shield to hide its identity support a finding of bad faith on the part of the Respondent.

##### **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 ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), 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 3.1](#), 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.

Moreover, UDRP panels have found that domain names identical to a complainant's trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1. Here, the disputed domain name consists solely of the Complainant's CLARINS mark, which is likely to mislead Internet users into believing that the website at the disputed domain name is related to and/or operated by the Complainant itself, contrary to the fact.

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.

First, the disputed domain name consists solely of the Complainant's famous CLARINS trademark. Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a famous or widely-known trademark by an unaffiliated entity can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

The disputed domain name redirects to the Registrar's landing page advertising the disputed domain name for sale. Circumstances indicating that a domain name was registered for the bad-faith purpose of selling it to a trademark owner can be highly fact-specific; the nature of the domain name and the distinctiveness of trademark at issue, among other factors, are relevant to this inquiry. The Panel finds that the Complainant's trademark is famous and by registering an identical domain name, the Respondent had the Complainant and its trademark in mind. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.1

Moreover, the Complainant has provided evidence that MX servers associated with the disputed domain name have been configured to allow email to be sent from the disputed domain name, thereby potentially enabling the Respondent to mislead or deceive potential recipients. This presents an implied ongoing threat to the Complainant and further supports a finding of bad faith under these circumstances.

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 <clarins.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Kathryn Lee/*

**Kathryn Lee**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 23, 2026