

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Byoma Limited v. shi yang
Case No. D2026-0498

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is shi yang, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <byoma.buzz>, <byoma.cyou> and <byoma.live> are registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 5, 2026. On February 6, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On February 9, 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 Purposes, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 9, 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 February 11, 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 February 12, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Philippe Gilliéron as the sole panelist in this matter on March 10, 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 skincare brand founded in 2020 in Scotland, United Kingdom (UK). Operating under the brand name BYOMA, the Complainant is one of the many brands under the parent company Bansk Group. Its products are sold internationally through numerous retailers. Having operated since 2022, the Complainant had generated half a billion USD in sales by 2025.

The Complainant's products have been launched in stores and online at beauty retailers, including but not limited to Sephora, Boots and Space NK across the United Kingdom, Europe and the Middle East. In addition, the Complainant's products are available online and in-stores of retailers in the United States of America ("US") and Canada, including Ulta and Target. The Complainant further carries out its online activities under the domain name <byoma.com>.

The Complainant has received numerous awards since 2022 for its innovative products in the skincare industry.

The Complainant owns numerous trademarks consisting of the term BYOMA, such as:

- UK trademark n° 00003610176 that was registered on August 6, 2021 in classes 3 and 35;
- European Union trademark n° 018443892 that was registered on October 14, 2021 in classes 3 and 35; and
- International trademark n° 1633315 that was registered on November 2, 2021 in class 3;
- US trademark n° 6690108 that was registered on April 5, 2022 in classes 3 and 35.

The Complainant also enjoys a strong social media presence in particular on Instagram, with 650,000 followers and TikTok, with 1.4 million followers.

The disputed domain names were registered by the Respondent on December 20, 2025 for <byoma.live>, December 24, 2025 for <byoma.buzz> and December 29, 2025 for <byoma.cyou>.

The Respondent initially used the disputed domain name <byoma.cyou> to display an online store impersonating the Complainant, which featured the Complainant's BYOMA logo and trademark and where the Respondent purported to sell the Complainant's products at discounted prices. Following an abuse complaint filed by the Complainant, the disputed domain name <byoma.cyou> was suspended and is now inactive. The other two disputed domain names also do not resolve to active websites.

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 the disputed domain names are identical to its trademark as they encompass the entirety of the BYOMA trademark without any additional element.

The Complainant further affirms that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. The Respondent does not have any rights in the term “Byoma”. It is not known under that name. Neither has the Respondent received any license from the Complainant to use the disputed domain names featuring the BYOMA trademark. The Respondent has not used, nor prepared to use the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant finally is of the view that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. In light of the recognition enjoyed by the BYOMA trademark, it is implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant’s BYOMA trademark when it registered the disputed domain names. Furthermore, the use made by the Respondent of the disputed domain names, in particular of <byoma.cyou> as described above, respectively and the passive holding of the disputed domain names without any contemplated good faith use, lead the Complainant to consider such use to be in bad faith.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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.”

Pursuant to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove each of the following three elements to obtain an order that the disputed domain names should be cancelled or transferred:

- (i) the disputed domain names registered by the Respondent are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or a service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names; and
- (iii) the disputed domain names have been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 names. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select 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 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the Complainant’s BYOMA trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are 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 names.

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 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.

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 Respondent was obviously aware of the Complainant’s BYOMA trademark when he registered the disputed domain names, as such a choice cannot be a pure coincidence but rather reflects a deliberate intent to appropriate the Complainant’s trademark in an illegitimate way.

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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed as the impersonation of the Complainant, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name <byoma.cyou> constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

As to <byoma.buzz> and <byoma.live>, which are merely passively held, Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or “coming soon” page) would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant’s trademark, the composition of the disputed domain names as well as the use made prior to suspension of <byoma.cyou>, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy. Taking the above factors into consideration and the composition of the disputed domain names, the Panel finds it implausible that the disputed domain names may be put to any good faith use.

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 <byoma.buzz>, <byoma.cyou> and <byoma.live> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Philippe Gilliéron/

Philippe Gilliéron

Sole Panelist

Date: March 10, 2026