

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Cosrx Inc. v. Joseph Jones, borla
Case No. D2026-1566

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Cosrx Inc., Republic of Korea, represented by KAI IP Law LLC, Republic of Korea.

The Respondent is Joseph Jones, borla, United States of America (“U.S.”).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <thecosrxca.com> is registered with Hello Internet Corp (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on April 14, 2026. On April 14, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 15, 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 (Anonymous) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 22, 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 amendment to the Complaint on April 30, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to 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 April 30, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 20, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on May 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Francine Tan as the sole panelist in this matter on June 2, 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, Cosrx Inc., is a Korean company, established in 2013, that is engaged in the production, development, advertising, and sale of cosmetics and skincare products under the COSRX trademark. The Complainant states that it has become one of the leading Korean-beauty brands internationally, including having achieved the status of the No. 1 brand in the skincare sector in the Philippines on Shopee, the No. 2 brand in the skincare sector in Malaysia on Shopee. There are also 1.3 billion cumulative views of the brand on TikTok.

The Complainant owns trade mark registrations for COSRX in numerous jurisdictions worldwide, including, among others:

- Republic of Korea Trade Mark Registration No. 45-0053095, registered on January 5, 2015;
- U.S. Trade Mark Registration No. 5,271,842, registered on August 22, 2017; and
- International Registration No. 1334993, registered on January 12, 2017, designating, among other jurisdictions: Australia, France, Germany, Japan, Norway, Singapore, Spain, the United Kingdom, and Viet Nam.

The Complainant also owns and operates domain names incorporating the COSRX trademark, including <cosrx.co.kr> and <cosrx.com>.

The disputed domain name <thecosrxca.com> was registered on April 10, 2026. It resolves to a website that uses the COSRX name and branding prominently, displaying "COSRX Official" as the website title, featuring product images and descriptions identical to those on the Complainant's official website, and purporting to offer cosmetic products for purchase.

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:

- (i) The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's COSRX trade mark which is very well known. The disputed domain name incorporates the COSRX mark in its entirety. The addition of the definite article "the" and the geographical abbreviation "ca", which may be understood as referring to Canada, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity with the Complainant's COSRX trade mark.
- (ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant has not granted permission to the Respondent to use or register any domain name incorporating the COSRX trade mark. The Respondent is not related to the Complainant in any way.

(iii) The disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The COSRX trade mark has been registered since 2015, which is 10 years before the registration date of the disputed domain name. The Respondent was undoubtedly fully aware of the Complainant's trade mark which is one of the most famous cosmetics brands in the world. The Respondent's website operates as a copycat site, reproducing the Complainant's COSRX product images, branding, and site layout without authorization. The Respondent has used its website to offer various cosmetic products bearing the COSRX trade mark, which are apparently identical to those 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 a trade mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the COSRX mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name <thecosrxca.com>. The Panel notes that the disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's mark in full, with the addition of the definite article "the" and the geographical abbreviation "ca". The addition of the elements "the" and "ca" does not prevent the finding of confusing similarity with the Complainant's COSRX trade mark which is identifiable in the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the COSRX trade mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.8.

The Panel therefore 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.

The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized or licensed to use the COSRX trade mark or to register the disputed domain name. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the name "cosrxca", "thecosrxca", or any related designation. The Respondent's website is presented as "official" and uses the Complainant's branding and product images, without permission. Such use does not constitute a bona fide commercial offering or legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

Turning to the disputed domain name itself, it is composed of the Complainant's trademark combined with the definite article "the" and the geographical abbreviation "ca". That abbreviation could be perceived to refer to Canada or the State of California, U.S., the latter being the apparent location of the Respondent. The inclusion of the element "ca" may serve to enhance the likelihood of confusion, by suggesting that the website to which the disputed domain name resolves is the Complainant's official Canadian website or is targeted at consumers from the State of California.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, which in this case is passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel therefore 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 disputed domain name incorporates the entirety of the Complainant's distinctive and well-established trade mark. The COSRX trade mark has been used and registered for many years by the Complainant. It is evident from the content and layout of the Respondent's website that the Respondent knew of and deliberately targeted the Complainant and its COSRX trade mark at the time it registered the disputed domain name.

Further, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed as applicable to this case: 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 therefore 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 <thecosrxca.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Francine Tan/

Francine Tan

Sole Panelist

Date: June 15, 2026