

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Crowned Skin Group LLC, (dba Crowned Skin) v. mercury mercury, TRY APOLLON

Case No. D2026-0741

1. The Parties

Complainant is Crowned Skin Group LLC, (dba Crowned Skin), United States of America (“United States” or “U.S”), represented by Foley & Lardner LLP, United States.

Respondent is mercury mercury, TRY APOLLON, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <thecrownedskin.com> is registered with Tucows Domains Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on February 20, 2026. On February 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On February 23, 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 / Contact Privacy Inc. Customer 0177369069) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on February 24, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on February 25, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on February 27, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 19, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on March 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Scott R. Austin as the sole panelist in this matter on March 30, 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 following facts appear from the Complaint (as amended) and its attached Annexes, which have not been contested by Respondent, and provide evidence sufficient to support:

Complainant, an Illinois limited liability company headquartered in Oak Park, Illinois, United States, is a manufacturer and distributor of men's skincare products offered under CROWNED SKIN in which the Complainant claims unregistered trademark rights (the "CROWNED SKIN Mark") since its inception in March 2024. Complainant shows it is a leader in the men's grooming products industry having achieved among other accolades, number one on the TikTok Store for men's grooming and named among the Top 50 brands on Amazon. Complainant also shows that since its inception in March 2024 its substantial expenditures in advertising and promotion gained a substantial audience across all social media platforms (approximately 102,000 Instagram followers; 28,000 Facebook followers; 24,300 TikTok followers with 84,700 likes), showing nationwide recognition and consumer engagement evidenced by third-party media postings and features, news reports and industry articles about the company and its founder.

Complainant also shows it incorporates the CROWNED SKIN Mark in its official domain name <crownedskin.com> that Complainant has continuously and exclusively used since February 1, 2024, to own and operate its official website ("Official Website"), where Complainant offers and advertises its men's grooming products under the CROWNED SKIN Mark.

Complainant claims unregistered, common-law trademark rights in the United States marketplace based on "continuous, uninterrupted use of the [CROWNED SKIN Mark] alone or in combination with other word and design elements, in selling and distributing its viral skincare products" since at least as early as March 2024, and substantial online advertisements and promotions at a cost in excess of USD 10 million which has resulted in "rapid and sustained commercial success and sales" as well as substantial and accelerated media attention and recognition since its founding in 2024 supported by evidence submitted in the Annexes to its Complaint, including a Declaration signed by Complainant's CEO providing advertising expenditures, sales revenues and other indicia typically provided in support of acquired distinctiveness to establish unregistered trademark rights.

Complainant has also submitted evidence of pending application for U.S. Trademark Registration of its CROWNED SKIN Mark (the "Word Mark Application") for consideration by the Panel as evidence of its efforts to obtain statutory rights in the CROWNED SKIN Mark.

The Whois record shows that Respondent registered the disputed domain name on February 2, 2026. Complainant claims that on or about February 14, 2026, Complainant's team flagged Respondent's registration and unauthorized use of the disputed domain name and the CROWNED SKIN Mark on Respondent's resolving website ("Respondent's Site"), which Respondent operated to offer directly competing and identical skin care products using Complainant's CROWNED SKIN Mark and displayed the fraudulent statement "Crowned Skin is only sold on this website. Any product listed on Amazon or eBay is counterfeit and not genuine Crowned Skin," explicitly attempting to pass itself off as the sole source of Complainant's CROWNED SKIN Mark products. The Panel's independent investigation of the disputed domain name found that as of the date visited, April 7, 2026, the website appeared to be no longer active. Numerous cases support a panel's power to undertake such limited factual research, and the Panel has, in its discretion, examined Respondent's Site as well as the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") database for the current status of Complainant's US trademark application data.¹

¹. "Noting in particular the general powers of a panel articulated inter alia in paragraphs 10 and 12 of the UDRP Rules, it has been accepted that a panel may undertake limited factual research into matters of public record if it would consider such information useful to

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, Complainant contends: 1) that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant's CROWNED SKIN Mark because it is configured to contain the CROWNED SKIN Mark in its entirety, appended to the article "the", which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity; 2) that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, nor has Respondent ever been commonly known by the disputed domain name; and 3) that the disputed domain name was registered and is used in bad faith because Respondent used the disputed domain name to impersonate Complainant and sell competing, possibly counterfeit CROWNED SKIN Mark products for Respondent's commercial benefit.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

There are no exceptional circumstances within paragraph 5(e) of the Rules to prevent this Panel from determining the present dispute based upon the Complaint (as amended), notwithstanding the failure of any person to lodge a substantive formal Response in compliance with the Rules. Under paragraph 14 of the Rules, where a party does not comply with any provision of the Rules, the Panel shall "draw such inferences therefrom as it considers appropriate".

Where no substantive Response is filed, however, Complainant must still make out its case in all respects under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy. To succeed, Complainant must demonstrate that the requirements for each of the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied.

The Panel will address its findings on each of these elements in more detail below.

The standard of proof under the Policy is often expressed as the "balance of the probabilities" or "preponderance of the evidence" standard. Under this standard, an asserting party needs to establish that it is more likely than not that the claimed fact is true. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.2.

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 Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Declaration signed by Complainant's CEO declares that Complainant has continuously and exclusively owned and operated its Official Website using the domain name <crownedskin.com> since February 1, 2024, where since March 2024 Complainant has and continues to promote and sell its body butter and body

assessing the case merits and reaching a decision, in particular to affirm or corroborate a party's contention. This may include visiting the website linked to the disputed domain name in order to obtain more information about the respondent or its use of the domain name [...] or accessing trademark registration databases." WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.8. See e.g., *Humble Bundle, Inc. v. Domain Admin, Whois Privacy Corp.*, WIPO Case No. [D2016-0914](#); and *Creative NetVentures, Inc. v. Webheads*, WIPO Case No. [D2000-1655](#).

oils under the CROWNED SKIN Mark. The Panel has independently verified the historical captures of the Official Website on Internet Web Archives and is satisfied that it has been active since at least February 2024.²

Complainant claims unregistered trademark rights and contends that as of the filing of the Complaint, unregistered rights in the CROWNED SKIN Mark were established through acquired distinctiveness through use and advertising evidence as well as reference to pending Word Mark Application No. 98676100 filed on July 31, 2024.

A consensus of prior UDRP panels has determined the relevant evidence to demonstrate acquired distinctiveness (also referred to as secondary meaning) to find a complainant has established trademark rights at common law includes a range of factors such as (i) the duration and nature of use of the mark (which may include social media presence and engagement), (ii) the amount of sales under the mark and during which time period, (iii) the nature and extent of advertising using the mark – including evidence of expenditures over a relevant time period,, (iv) the degree of actual public (e.g., consumer, industry such as trade and professional associations, media) recognition, and (v) consumer surveys. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3. In addition, as the Panel’s consideration of Respondent’s bad faith use of its website in evaluating the second and third elements below, the fact that a respondent is shown to have been targeting a complainant’s mark (e.g., based on the manner in which the related website is used) may also support a complainant’s assertion that its mark has achieved significance as a source identifier. *Id.*

First, as for the pending Word Mark Application submitted, the Panel observes: 1) pending trademark applications would not by themselves establish trademark rights within the meaning of UDRP paragraph 4(a)(i). See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.1.4; 2) according to its USPTO file history the pending application for registration of the Word Mark Application highlighted for consideration in the Complaint was filed in the name of a company other than Complainant, “King Skin LLC DBA CrownedSkin”, which entity’s relationship to Complainant is unaccounted for in the Complaint; but after brief investigation of the Illinois Secretary of State records by the Panel it appears a “Kings Skin LLC” (plural in the original) was Complainant’s original name at formation prior to amendment to Crowned Skin Group LLC; and 3) the Word Mark Application is suspended due to a conflict with a previously filed pending application. Based on the foregoing discrepancies unaccounted for in the record the Panel finds the pending application should be given no consideration in assessing unregistered rights in the CROWNED SKIN Mark.

The Panel notes however that this is not determinative, as Complainant has furnished un rebutted evidence, including media recognition, to show that CROWNED SKIN has acquired sufficient relevant secondary meaning in connection with Complainant’s products sufficient to confer trademark rights on Complainant.

Based on the evidence of widespread and accelerated recognition of the CROWNED SKIN Mark through exclusive and continuous use since March 2024, substantial investment in advertising and promotion noted in section 4 above, as well as awards and third party recognition in relevant trade media and recognition by consumers relevant to its industry set forth in signed declarations and evidence submitted, the Panel finds unregistered trademark rights in the CROWNED SKIN Mark have been established as of the filing of the Complaint sufficient to satisfy the first element of the Policy. Prior UDRP panels have found unregistered rights based on these factors. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.3. See also *Imperial College v. Christophe Dessimoz*, WIPO Case No. [D2004-0322](#).

The Panel also notes that for purposes of the first element assessment, it is not necessary that a complainant’s trademark rights predate the registration of the domain name concerned. All that is required is that such rights are in existence at the time the complaint is filed. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.1.3.

². <https://web.archive.org/web/20240202103909/https://crownedskin.com/>

With Complainant's rights in the CROWNED SKIN Mark established, the remaining question under the first element of the Policy is whether the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant's CROWNED SKIN Mark. Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is clearly a facsimile of Complainant's CROWNED SKIN Mark.

Prior UDRP panels have held that the incorporation of the entirety of a trademark in a domain name is sufficient to establish identity or confusing similarity for purposes of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.8 ("Where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element"); see also *Carrefour SA v. yuri eros*, "נינת ביתן" בע"מ, WIPO Case No. [D2022-1277](#).

Except for the word "the," the disputed domain name is essentially identical to Complainant's CROWNED SKIN Mark. The disputed domain name: (a) incorporates the two terms "CROWNED SKIN" comprising Complainant's Mark; and (b) merely introduces them with the word "the" and follows them with only the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com". These minor differences do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and Complainant's CROWNED SKIN Mark. See *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0903](#).

The addition of the gTLD ".com" is irrelevant in determining whether the disputed domain name is confusingly similar. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11. See also, *Philip Morris Products S.A. v. Stanislav Severin*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-1546](#).

This Panel finds confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and Complainant's CROWNED SKIN Mark, which remains fully recognizable as incorporated in its entirety into the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Complainant contends that none of the circumstances provided in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy for demonstrating a respondent's rights to and legitimate interests in a domain name are present in this case. Respondent has not rebutted 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, Complainant contends that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Complainant asserts that it has no commercial relationship with Respondent, Respondent is not

sponsored by or affiliated with Complainant in any way, and Complainant has not given Respondent authority or license to register or use Complainant's trademark in any manner, including in domain names.

Second, there is no evidence to suggest that Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, which evinces a lack of rights or legitimate interests under Policy paragraph 4(c)(ii). Respondent, as registrant/registrant organization for the disputed domain name, identified as "mercury mercury" and "TRY APOLLON" respectively, is not commonly known by the disputed domain name because these terms clearly bear no resemblance to the disputed domain name. Prior UDRP panels have held where no evidence, including the Whois record for the disputed domain name, suggests that Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, then Respondent cannot be regarded as having acquired rights to or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name within the meaning of Policy paragraph 4(c)(ii). See *Moncler S.p.A. v. Bestinfo*, WIPO Case No. [D2004-1049](#).

Most importantly, Complainant contends Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services because, as Complainant's attached screen shots of the web pages accessed through the disputed domain name show, the disputed domain name resolves to a website carefully crafted to pass itself off as Complainant's Official Website in order to create a false association with Complainant.

The Panel notes that evidence submitted persuasively supports Complainant's argument because it shows Respondent's Site prominently features the unauthorized use of Complainant's digital images of its skincare products and offers the possibility for users to order products in competition with Complainant's products. The website does not include any information or disclaimer on its lack of relationship with Complainant; on the contrary, it contains a statement "Crowned Skin is only sold on this website. Any product listed on Amazon or eBay is counterfeit and not genuine Crowned Skin." Respondent's activities therefore undermine any claim of rights and legitimate interests because Respondent is using the disputed domain name to confuse Internet users and suggest an affiliation with or sponsorship by Complainant to direct Internet users to Respondent's Website for its own commercial gain. Based on these facts the Panel finds Respondent's actions are clearly not legitimate and clearly are misleading. Respondent, therefore, cannot establish rights or legitimate interests pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. See *Six Continents Hotels v. "m on"*, WIPO Case No. [D2012-2525](#); see also *Frankie Shop LLC v. Jie Wen*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-4197](#).

It is a well-established principle according to a consensus of UDRP panels that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity such as passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.13.1. See also *Frankie Shop LLC v. Domain Protection Services Inc. / My Mo*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-0825](#).

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

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 sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and is used in bad faith, but other circumstances may also 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.

Complainant contends that Respondent registered the disputed domain name in bad faith. First, Complainant contends that Respondent's configuration of the disputed domain name demonstrates targeting through knowledge of and familiarity with Complainant's well publicized brand and skincare products. By

registering a domain name that incorporates the CROWNED SKIN Mark in its entirety with the addition of only “the” appended. Complainant contends such composition also shows Respondent’s intent to create a false association in the minds of consumers between Respondent’s offered men’s grooming and skincare products which appear identical to those of Complainant under the CROWNED SKIN Mark making it implausible that Respondent was not aware of Complainant’s CROWNED SKIN Mark and its association with men’s grooming and skincare products, given the brand’s fast growing renown - both generally, and in the skincare business in which Respondent’s Site is reported to operate.

The Panel notes there can be no doubt of Respondent’s knowledge of Complainant’s mark since Complainant shows that Respondent actually offers (or at least, claims to offer) men’s skincare products under the CROWNED SKIN Mark on Respondent’s Site using identical digital images of the CROWNED SKIN Mark products. Further, as noted in section 4, Respondent’s Site fraudulently states in bold font style: “Crowned Skin is only sold on this website. Any product listed on Amazon or eBay is counterfeit and not genuine Crowned Skin,” explicitly attempting to pass itself off as the sole source of Complainant’s CROWNED SKIN Mark products. Respondent has thereby intentionally created the disputed domain name that is confusingly similar to Complainant’s trademark, and similar to its official domain name. Prior UDRP panels have found a domain name was registered in bad faith where the respondent registered a domain name for the purpose of intentionally attempting to impersonate or mislead Internet users. See, e.g., *Houghton Mifflin Co. v. The Weathermen, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2001-0211](#); and *Accor v. Jiangdeyun*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-2277](#).

Noting the composition of the disputed domain name incorporating Complainant’s mark with an added term “the” and its impersonating use, the Panel finds there is no obvious possible justification for Respondent’s selection of the disputed domain name other than to target Complainant’s mark, which is bad faith. See *Frankie Shop LLC v. Bgeew Aferg*, WIPO Case No. [D2022-3619](#).

Further, in this instance it is clear to the Panel, however, that the recognition Complainant and its CROWNED SKIN Mark received was sufficient for Respondent to notice and capitalize on the CROWNED SKIN Mark when the disputed domain name was registered on February 4, 2026. Indeed, the record provides no other plausible explanation for the registration of the disputed domain name.

In this regard, Respondent’s Site clearly attempts to pass itself off as not only associated with Complainant, but also as the exclusive source for Complainant’s CROWNED SKIN Mark products - which would only have value for Respondent to the extent there is source-identifying capacity in Complainant’s offering – there is no doubt Respondent targeted Complainant and its CROWNED SKIN Mark and registered the disputed domain name in bad faith to unfairly capitalize on Complainant’s unregistered trademark rights. The disputed domain name was registered after CROWNED SKIN received significant media attention regarding the launch and release of its skincare products under the CROWNED SKIN Mark. The Panel finds the disputed domain name was clearly registered in bad faith by Respondent with knowledge of Complainant’s CROWNED SKIN Mark and with the intention of taking advantage of the reputation that had attached to that Mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), Section 3.8.2.

Based on detailed discussion in above section 6.B. on Respondent’s Site offering its men’s grooming and skincare products under CROWNED SKIN Mark, Respondent is also using the disputed domain name in bad faith. Prior UDRP panels have held that the use of a domain name for the illegitimate activity here, namely, impersonation/passing off, constitutes bad faith use. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that 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 <thecrownedskin.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Scott R. Austin/

Scott R. Austin

Sole Panelist

Date: April 13, 2026