

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Huda Beauty Limited v. Mark Cooper
Case No. D2026-0648

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Huda Beauty Limited, British Virgin Islands, United Kingdom, represented by Rouse Consultancy (Shanghai) Ltd., China.

The Respondent is Mark Cooper, United States of America ("US").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <hudabeauty.mom> is registered with Porkbun LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on February 14, 2026. On February 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 16, 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 (Redacted For Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 17, 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 20, 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 March 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 22, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on March 25, 2026.

The Center appointed William Lobelson as the sole panelist in this matter on March 31, 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 company founded by Ms Huda Kattan, to develop beauty products under the brand HUDABEAUTY.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations for HUDABEAUTY, inter alia:

- European trademark HUDABEAUTY No. 015755549 of December 19, 2016;
- US trademark HUDABEAUTY No. 5459220 of May 1, 2018.

The Complainant's official web site is operated under the domain name <hudabeauty.com>, that was registered on April 3, 2010.

The disputed domain name is <hudabeauty.mom>. It was registered on December 11, 2025 and is directed to a web site that copies the contents of the Complainant's official web site, such as the trademark, texts, photographs and representation of products.

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 earlier trademark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that the disputed domain name has been registered and used in bad faith.

The Complainant puts the emphasis on the fact that the disputed domain name is used to impersonate the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Notwithstanding the default of the Respondent, it remains incumbent on the Complainant to make out its case in all respects under the Rules set out in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. Namely, the Complainant must prove that:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (paragraph 4(a)(i));

(ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (paragraph 4(a)(ii)); and

(iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith (paragraph 4(a)(iii)).

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 Select 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 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.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, particularly by asserting that the Respondent is not affiliated with it in any way and that it never authorized the Respondent to use its trademark as part of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further claims that the Respondent is not known under the disputed domain name, does not own any proprietary rights in the name "hudabeauty" and does not make any bona fide use - neither commercial nor noncommercial, of the same.

The Complainant highlights that the disputed domain name routes towards an active website where its trademark and its products are exhibited.

A comparison of the Complainant's website and the Respondent's website (as per screenshots supplied by the Complainant) reflects that some texts, images and photographs of the Complainant's products, as published in its own website, are reproduced in the Respondent's website.

The Complainant claims that the Respondent is not engaged in a bona fide commercial use of the disputed domain name for its website would be fictitious and that, in any case, should actual sales be performed, the products offered for sale by the Respondent would most likely be counterfeits.

In any event, the Panel also notices that the disputed domain name is formed with the Complainant's trademark, and that the related website does not contain any disclaimer that the same is not run by the Complainant, as sole trademark owner and manufacturer of the trademarked products.

Even if the Respondent was an unauthorized but legitimate reseller of the Complainant's goods, it should have inserted in its website a clear disclaimer informing the public that it is not the manufacturer of the goods, but only a distributor, all the more since the disputed domain name induces that the same is related to the official online store of the Complainant ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8).

It is a consensus view among UDRP panels that a reseller or distributor can be making a bona fide offering of goods and services and thus have a legitimate interest in the domain name if its use meets certain requirements. These requirements normally include the actual offering of goods and services at issue, the use of the site to sell only the trademarked goods, and the site is accurately and prominently disclosing the registrant's relationship with the trademark holder. See: *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#); and *ITT Manufacturing Enterprises, Inc., ITT Corporation v. Douglas Nicoll, Differential Pressure Instruments, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-0936](#).

In the present matter, in the absence of any disclaimer and the nature of the disputed domain name comprising the Complainant's trademark in its entirety, which carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant, and taking into account the contentions of the Complainant, that the Respondent has not contested, the Panel finds that the Complainant has met the requirement under the Policy of showing that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

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 has used the disputed domain name in relation with a website that copies the contents of the Complainant's official website and thus passes it off as the Complainant.

There is no doubt in the present matter that the Respondent had the Complainant's trademark in mind when it registered the disputed domain name, as the Respondent's website does exhibit the Complainant products and reproduces images, texts and photographs taken from the Complainant's website.

It is also noted that the Respondent's website is confusing as it can be construed by any unsuspecting Internet users as the genuine online store of the Complainant. As stated above, the said website does not contain any disclaimer informing the public that the Respondent is not the original manufacturer of the trademarked goods.

On the contrary, the Respondent's web site even features the notice "© 2025 Huda Beauty. Holiday Exclusive Offer."

The Respondent is thus making a misleading and possible fraudulent use of the Complainant's trademarks and images of products, with a view to diverting traffic to its own profit.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or activity, here, claimed passing off 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 constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <hudabeauty.mom> be transferred to the Complainant.

/William Lobelson/

William Lobelson

Sole Panelist

Date: April 9, 2026