

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

AS Beauty Group LLC v. Maci Woyat, Maci Woyat
Case No. D2026-1382

1. The Parties

The Complainant is AS Beauty Group LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Dorsey & Whitney, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Maci Woyat, Maci Woyat, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <laurgelerbauty.com> is registered with Dominet (HK) Limited (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on March 31, 2026. On April 1, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 2, 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 April 7, 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 April 9, 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 April 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was April 30, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 1, 2026.

The Center appointed Nels T. Lippert as the sole panelist in this matter on May 5, 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 Delaware, United States, limited liability company having a place of business in New York, New York, United States. The LAURA GELLER brand was founded by the professional makeup artist Laura Geller, who was a pioneer in artisan-crafter baked makeup for all skin types. The Complainant acquired and has been using the LAURA GELLER trademarks since 2019. Annual sales of LAURA GELLER digital beauty and cosmetics in 2025 exceeded USD 300 million. The Complainant has registered the domain names <laurageller.com> and <lauragellerbeauty.com>, both of which resolve to the Complainant's website which promotes the Complainant and the Complainant's cosmetic products. The Complainant is the owner of United States trademark registrations of the LAURA GELLER trademark either in the standard character form or with designs and additional formatives such as LAURA GELLER NEW YORK. Representative examples of registrations of the LAURA GELLER and LAURA GELLER NEW YORK marks include:

- United States Registration No. 3,527,188 registered on November 4, 2008;
- United States Registration No. 4,787,513 registered on August 4, 2015; and
- United States Registration No. 5,495,610 registered on June 19, 2018.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 19, 2026. As of the date of filing of the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website that displayed the Complainant's trademarks and offered products under the LAURA GELLER name at deeply discounted prices.

The Respondent appears to be an individual who resides in the United States.

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 LAURA GELLER marks differing only by misspellings amounting to typosquatting. Specifically, the Complainant notes that the disputed domain name differs from the LAURA GELLER mark by removing a letter "a" from "laura" and a letter "l" from "geller". Additionally, the disputed domain name contains the term "baauty" which is a misspelling of the descriptive word "beauty".

The Complainant additionally alleges that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because it is not a licensee or affiliate of the Complainant and has never been authorized to use the Complainant's trademarks. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that copies the overall look and feel of the Complainant's own website and was used to sell cosmetics bearing the Complainant's trademarks that were either counterfeits or for collecting payments without delivering the goods which does not constitute bona fide offering of goods or services. The Complainant further alleges that the disputed domain name was used as an impersonation tool to generate consumer deception and fraud.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith because the Respondent had at least constructive notice of the Complainant's rights in the LAURA GELLER marks before registering the disputed domain name, which is evidence of bad faith registration. Additionally, the Complainant asserts that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name falsely impersonates the Complainant intending to deceive Internet customers into believing that they are interacting with the Complainant or an affiliate of the Complainant. Also, the Complainant argues that prior decisions in UDRP actions further demonstrate a pattern of bad faith behavior by registering domain names which infringe on the trademark rights of others.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

As noted above, the Respondent did not respond to the Complainant's allegations. Under the Rules, paragraphs 5(f) and 14(a), the effect of a default by the Respondent is that, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the Panel shall proceed to a decision on the basis of the Complaint. The Panel does not find any exceptional circumstance in this case.

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy provides that in order to divest a respondent of a domain name, a complainant must demonstrate each of the following:

- (i) the 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 domain name; and
- (iii) the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

Under paragraph 15(a) of the Rules, "[a] Panel shall 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".

In this case, the Panel finds that as a result of the Respondent's failure to submit a Response, the Respondent has failed to rebut any of the reasonable factual assertions that are made and supported by evidence submitted by the Complainant. By failing to respond, the Respondent has failed to offer the Panel any of the types of evidence set forth in paragraph 4(c) of the Policy or otherwise, from which the Panel might conclude that the Respondent has any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Moreover, the Respondent failed to provide any information or reasoning that might rebut the Complainant's arguments that the Respondent has acted 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 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. It is well established that a domain name that consists of a variation of a trademark such as intentional misspelling, referred to as typosquatting, as is found here, is considered to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

Although the addition of other terms – here, the misspelled descriptive term “bauty” – may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

Furthermore, it is well established that the applicable Top-Level Domain in a domain name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity here, claimed as applicable to this case: sale of counterfeit goods, copycat sites, or passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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 has not refuted the Complainant’s allegations that the disputed domain name was registered and used to attract for commercial gain, Internet users for creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s marks. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4. The Panel also notes that the Respondent appears to be engaged in a pattern of bad faith behavior by registering domain names which infringe on the trademark rights of others. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.2.

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 illegitimate activity here, claimed as applicable to this case: sale of counterfeit goods, copycat sites, or 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 <laurgelerbauty.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Nels T. Lippert/

Nels T. Lippert

Sole Panelist

Date: May 19, 2026