

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

BEAUTYCOM v. Nunes Miyake, nunes
Case No. D2026-0619

1. The Parties

The Complainant is BEAUTYCOM, France, represented by Ooslo Avocats, France.

The Respondent is Nunes Miyake, nunes, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <blissim-fr.online> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 13, 2026. On February 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 13, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the 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 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 15, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on March 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Charles Gielen as the sole panelist in this matter on March 27, 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's business activity consists of the retail sale of cosmetic products through online sales websites, subscription boxes, and physical stores. Moreover, the Complainant has been offering, on a recurring basis for several years, an Advent calendar of cosmetic products during the end-of-year period, a product appearing in its catalogue.

The Complainant holds a portfolio of registrations for the trade mark BLISSIM. This portfolio includes among others:

- International Registration No. 1580666 registered on October 29, 2020, for goods and services in classes 3, 5, 9, 14, 16, 18, 21, 25, 26 and 35 and covering numerous countries.
- French registration No. 4684702 registered on September 22, 2020 for goods and services in classes 3, 9, 14, 16, 18, 21, 25, 26 and 35.
- French registration No. 4658874 registered on June 19, 2020, for goods and services in classes 3, 21 and 35.

Furthermore, the Complainant has registered numerous domain names containing the word "blissim".

The disputed domain name was registered on December 1, 2025 and resolves to a website on which BLISSIM branded products of the Complainant are being sold such as an Advent calendar of cosmetic products and whose presentation is identical to that of the Complainant's official website.

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 the Complainant's trade mark. The disputed domain name contains an exact reproduction of the Complainant's trade mark BLISSIM, which constitutes its dominant distinctive element of the disputed domain name. The only difference between the trade mark BLISSIM and the disputed domain name lies in the addition of a barely perceptible hyphen and the term "fr", which nevertheless reinforces the impression of affiliation between the disputed domain name and the Complainant by making an express reference to the territory of the Complainant's activity, namely the marketing of cosmetic products, particularly in France. The Complainant also contends that the mere addition of the extension "online" is irrelevant and cannot be taken into consideration when assessing confusing similarity.

Furthermore, the Complainant contends that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant gives several reasons for this. First, to the Complainant's knowledge, the Respondent has no rights in the designation "BLISSIM" and has never acquired any prior rights in this sign. Second, the Respondent is in no way affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized by the latter to use its BLISSIM trade mark or to register the domain name incorporating the Complainant's prior trade mark. Third, the fact that the disputed domain name redirects to a website offering for sale products and services identical to those of the Complainant, including in particular Advent calendars containing cosmetic products, on which the Complainant's trade mark BLISSIM was reproduced, clearly demonstrates that the Respondent sought to take advantage of the use of a domain name nearly identical to the Complainant's prior trade mark, thereby creating a manifest risk of confusion. According to the Complainant the Respondent has not made a legitimate, non-commercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, since its sole intention was to create confusion in the minds of the public by leading them to believe that the disputed domain name was connected to the Complainant's prior rights.

Finally, the Complainant argues that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

With respect to the bad faith registration of the disputed domain name, the Complainant contends that the Respondent could not have been unaware of the Complainant's prior rights at the time of registration of the disputed domain name. The trade mark BLISSIM of the Complainant enjoys significant reputation. It is therefore undeniable that the Respondent had the Complainant's prior rights in mind at the time of registration of the disputed domain name.

With respect to bad faith use of the disputed domain name, the Complainant contends that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website through the disputed domain name, for commercial purposes, by creating a manifest risk of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks. This follows from the fact that the disputed domain name redirects to a website whose presentation is identical to that of the Complainant's official website, on which products and services similar to those of the Complainant were offered for sale, including in particular Advent calendars containing cosmetic products and on which the Respondent uses the trade mark BLISSIM of the Complainant.

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of trade marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trade mark. It contains the word "blissim" and the only difference between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trade mark is that the disputed domain name has the additional geographical indicator "fr", preceded by a hyphen. This difference does not prevent the finding of confusing similarity between the trade mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Therefore, the requirement under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy is met.

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 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.

First, the Respondent did not show that it owns any rights to the name "blissim" nor that it has any license or other authorisation from the Complainant to use its trade mark BLISSIM. Second, the Respondent did not argue that it is commonly known, or that it has ever been known under the name "blissim-fr". Furthermore, the Panel did not find any evidence that the Respondent has used, or prepared to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. On the contrary, the website to which the disputed domain name resolves shows cosmetic products such as the products offered for sale by the Complainant in connection with which the trade mark BLISSIM is used and presented in a way that is very similar to the presentation of the products on the Complainant's website. Such activities cannot be a bona fide offering of goods or services and do not create any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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.

With respect to the registration of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the Respondent clearly had the trade mark of the Complainant in mind when registering the disputed domain name. This is obvious because the website to which the disputed domain name resolves shows the trade mark of the Complainant. The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is used in bad faith. This follows from the fact that the Respondent never received any authorization to use the trade mark BLISSIM. By using the disputed domain name, the Respondent intentionally attracts Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the trade mark BLISSIM as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the products offered on it. Such use clearly is use in 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 name <blissim-fr.online> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Charles Gielen/

Charles Gielen

Sole Panelist

Date: April 1, 2026