ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Byoma Limited v. da xiong, 陈 晓(Chen Xiao)
Case No. D2026-0336

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Byoma Limited, United Kingdom, represented by SafeNames Ltd., United Kingdom.

The Respondents are da xiong and 陈 晓 (Chen Xiao), China (collectively, "the Respondent").

2. The Domain Names and Registrar[s]

The disputed domain names <byama.top>, <byamo.cyou>, <byamos.store>, <byamous.store>, <byoman.store>, <byoman.top>, <byomao.store>, <byomao.top>, <byomaus.top>, <byomau.top>, <byoma.vip>, <byomosale.store>, <thebyomas.store>, <thebyoma.store>, and <thebyomas.vip> are registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on January 27, 2026. On January 28, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On January 29, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on January 29, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar(s), requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on the same day.

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 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was February 19, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on February 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Tobias Malte Müller as the sole panelist in this matter on March 2, 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

It results from the Complainant's undisputed allegations that it is a skincare brand founded in 2020 in Scotland, United Kingdom ("UK"). BYOMA products are available to purchase through the Complainant's website and shipped internationally, across the UK, the United States of America, and through numerous renowned beauty retailers globally such as Sephora and Space NK.

The Complainant is the registered owner of many trademarks consisting and/or containing BYOMA, e.g. European Union Trade Mark no. 018443892 BYOMA, registered on October 14, 2021 for goods and services in the classes 3 and 35.

Moreover, it uses the domain name <byoma.com> for its official website.

The fifteen disputed domain names were registered as follows:

- <thebyoma.store> on July 19, 2025,
- <thebyomas.store> on July 22, 2025;
- <byomosale.store> on July 29, 2025;
- <thebyomas.vip> on August 2, 2025;
- <byamo.cyou> on August 2, 2025;
- <byamous.store> on August 4, 2025;
- <byama.top> on September 5, 2025;
- <byomau.top> on September 5, 2025;
- <byomaus.top> on September 5, 2025;
- <byoman.top> on October 14, 2025;
- <byamos.store> on October 14, 2025;
- <byomao.top> on November 8, 2025;
- <byomao.store> on November 18, 2025;
- <byoma.vip> on December 1, 2025;
- <byoman.store> on December 29, 2025.

All the disputed domain names (but <byamo.cyou>) are registered by 陈 晓 (Chen Xiao), China.

The disputed domain name <byamo.cyou> is registered by da xiong, China.

Further, the undisputed evidence provided by the Complainant proves that the disputed domain names <byoman.store>, <byomao.store>, and <byoman.top> resolved to web shops entitled "BYOMA", allegedly offering Complainant's products and displaying without authorization the Complainant's trademark and logo and using the Complainant's copyrighted images and website imagery.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

(1) the disputed domain names are identical and confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark BYOMA. In particular, the disputed domain name <byoma.vip> is identical to the Complainant's BYOMA trademark as it encompasses the entirety of the BYOMA mark without additions. The disputed domain names <byomosale.store>, <byamo.cyou>, <byama.top>, <byamos.store>, and <byamous.store> are typo-variants of the Complainant's mark by either swapping or replacing the letters "a" and "o" in BYOMA. The mix-up of letters in this way is commonly referred to as "typosquatting". The remaining disputed domain names encompass the entirety of the Complainant's BYOMA mark with the addition of the words "the" and "sale" and the letters "n", "u", "s", and "o" after the mark. Where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a complainant's trademark and is easily recognisable in the domain name, this will be sufficient to establish identical or confusing similarity;

(2) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. According to the Complainant, the Respondent did not receive any license from the Complainant to use domain names featuring the BYOMA trademark. All the disputed domain names, at least at some point, resolved to inactive webpages. The non-use of a domain name is considered by panels to not be a bona fide offering of goods or services; the disputed domain names <byoman.store>, and <byomao.store> currently, and <byoman.top> previously have been used to display online stores, entitled "BYOMA", and purporting to sell the Complainant's products at discounted prices using the Complainant's copyrighted images and website imagery. Through these online shops, internet users were requested to enter sensitive information upon checkout. Due to this phishing activity, and at the request of the Complainant, the disputed domain name <byoman.top> was suspended by being placed in serverHold and now resolves to an inactive webpage. By creating these fake online stores, the Respondent intended to misleadingly divert the Complainant's customers to the disputed domain names in the hope of receiving commercial gain;

(3) the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. According to the Complainant, the BYOMA name has amassed substantial recognition in the field of skincare and beauty since its establishment in 2020. The Complainant has a strong reputation with the trademark within the beauty and skincare sector. The Complainant's BYOMA mark does not have any generic dictionary meaning, only existing in connection with the Complainant's brand. Taking into consideration the use of the disputed domain names and the use of images of official BYOMA products, it is implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's BYOMA brand and its offerings when registering the disputed domain names. The Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, online users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's BYOMA mark and offerings. The use of the disputed domain names to host online stores under the name "BYOMA", and featuring the Complainant's products, gives internet users a false impression that the sites are controlled or authorised by the Complainant. The previous use of some of the disputed domain names evidently shows there is no plausible future good faith use to be made by the Respondent. Based on this, it is likely that the other domain names were being used in the same manner at some point or in certain specific locations. Therefore, the current passive holding of the disputed domain names constitutes bad faith.

Finally, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has been involved in a previous UDRP proceeding: *AX Beauty Brands, LLC v. 陈晓(Xiao Chen)*, WIPO Case No. D2025-3201.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural issues

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that the Complainant submitted sufficient evidence to justify the consolidation in terms of common control of the disputed domain names or corresponding websites.

As set forth in section 4.11.2 of WIPO Overview 3.1: " Panels have considered a range of factors, typically present in some combination, as useful to determining whether such consolidation is appropriate, such as similarities in or relevant aspects of (i) the registrants' identity(ies) including pseudonyms, (ii) the registrants' contact information including email address(es), postal address(es), or phone number(s), including any pattern of irregularities, (iii) relevant IP addresses, name servers, or webhost(s), (iv) the content or layout of websites corresponding to the disputed domain names, (v) the nature of the marks at issue (e.g., where a registrant targets a specific sector), (vi) any naming patterns in the disputed domain names (e.g., <mark-country> or <mark-goods>), (vii) the relevant language/scripts of the disputed domain names particularly where they are the same as the mark(s) at issue, (viii) any changes by the respondent relating to any of the above items following communications regarding the disputed domain name(s), (ix) any evidence of respondent affiliation with respect to the ability to control the disputed domain name(s), (x) any (prior) pattern of similar respondent behavior, or (xi) other arguments made by the complainant and/or disclosures by the respondent(s)."

The Panel considers the consolidation as appropriate, taking into consideration the following factors:

(1) all disputed domain names follow the same naming pattern by incorporating the entirety of the Complainant's BYOMA trademark and typo-variants of BYOMA, interchanging the letters "o" and "a" in BYOMA. Specifically, the disputed domain name <byamo.cyou> is misspelt in the same way as <byamous.store> and <byamos.store>;

(2) all disputed domain names have the same Registrar;

(3) both registrant's contact information use Chinese postal addresses and phone numbers;

(4) the disputed domain names <byamo.cyou> and <thebyomas.vip> were registered on the same date;

(5) all disputed domain names are using the same name servers and hosting provider on IP addresses that begin in the same way (but the disputed domain name <byamos.store>).

On the balance of probabilities and taking into account the above circumstances of the present case, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names are under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants in a single proceeding.

6.2 Substantive issues

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs this Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable". Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires a complainant to prove each of the following three elements in order to obtain an order that each disputed domain name be transferred or cancelled:

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

The Panel will therefore proceed to analyze whether the three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are satisfied.

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 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 BYOMA is identically reproduced within the disputed domain name <byoma.vip>. Accordingly, this disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy, WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

In addition, the Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the remaining disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy, WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7. It is the view of this Panel that the replacement or the swapping of the vowel "o" with the vowel "a" and the addition of the letter "s", "us", "n", "o", or "u" in the disputed domain names <byama.top>, <byamo.cyou>, <byamos.store>, <byamous.store>, <byoman.store>, <byoman.top>, <byomao.store>, <byomao.top>, <byomau.top>, and <byomosale.store> results to be a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of the Complainant's trademark, and does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the Complainant's trademark BYOMA since the disputed domain names contains sufficiently recognizable aspects of the relevant mark (see WIPO Overview 3.1 at section 1.9).

Furthermore, although the addition of other terms here, "us", "the", and "s" in the disputed domain names <byomaus.top>, <thebyoma.store>, <thebyomas.store>, and <thebyomas.vip> (but also again <byamous.store> and <byomosale.store>) may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy, WIPO Overview 3.1, 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 that 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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Moreover, the Panel notes that the nature of the disputed domain names <byoma.vip> and <byomaus.top> carries a high risk of implied affiliation, since the first disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant's trademark and the second domain name contains the Complainant's registered trademark BYOMA and the geographic abbreviation "us". Generally speaking, previous UDRP panels have found that domain names identical to a complainant's trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation, in addition geographic terms (e.g., <trademark-usa.com>, or <trademark.nyc>) are typically seen as tending to suggest sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner (see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1). The Panel shares this view.

Further, the undisputed evidence provided by the Complainant proves that the disputed domain names <byoman.store>, <byomao.store>, and <byoman.top> resolved to web shops entitled "BYOMA", allegedly offering the Complainant's products and displaying without authorization the Complainant's trademark and logo and using the Complainant's copyrighted images and website imagery.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed copycat sites, passing off, or other types of fraud, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent, WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1. The Panel shares this view.

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 it results from the Complainant's evidence that the disputed domain names <byoman.store>, <byomao.store>, and <byoman.top> resolved to web shops entitled "BYOMA", allegedly offering Complainant's products and displaying without authorization the Complainant's trademark and logo and using the Complainant's copyrighted images and website imagery. For the Panel, it is therefore evident that the Respondent positively knew the Complainant's mark. Consequently, and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the Panel is convinced that the Respondent knew that the disputed domain names included the Complainant's trademark when it registered the disputed domain names.

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 3.1, section 3.2.1.

On this regard, the further circumstances surrounding the disputed domain names' registration and use confirm the findings that the Respondent has registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith:

(1) the nature of the disputed domain names, some of them being even identical to the Complainant's mark BYOMA, or incorporating the Complainant's mark plus the addition of a geographical term or some others being typosquatting domain names;

(2) the content of the website to which the disputed domain names <byoman.store>, <byomao.store>, and <byoman.top> resolved (i.e. web shops entitled "BYOMA", allegedly offering the Complainant's products and displaying without authorization the Complainant's trademark and logo and using the Complainant's copyrighted images and website imagery);

(3) a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no response for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain names;

(4) the Respondent concealing its identity through a privacy service;

(5) the Respondent having been involved in a number of abusive domain name registrations (i.e. *AX Beauty Brands, LLC v. 陈晓 (Xiao Chen)*, WIPO Case No. D2025-3201; *The Clorox Company v. Domain Administrator, See PrivacyGuardian.org / Xiao Cheng / Yien Hao Tong* WIPO Case No. D2021-0781). In the view of the Panel, this behavior demonstrates a pattern of conduct by the Respondent of taking advantage of trademarks of third parties without any right to do so and is indicative of the Respondent's bad faith. Previous UDRP panels have held that establishing a pattern of bad faith conduct requires more than one, but as few as two instances of abusive domain name registration, see WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.2. The Panel considers this to be the case here.

In light of the above, the Panel finds that the passive holding of the remaining disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

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 names <byama.top>, <byamo.cyou>, <byamos.store>, <byamous.store>, <byoman.store>, <byoman.top>, <byomao.store>, <byomao.top>, <byomaus.top>, <byomau.top>, <byoma.vip>, <byomosale.store>, <thebyomas.store>, <thebyoma.store>, and <thebyomas.vip> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Tobias Malte Müller/
Tobias Malte Müller
Sole Panelist
Date: March 16, 2026