

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Byoma Limited v. Magic Spoon  
Case No. D2026-1703

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Byoma Limited, United Kingdom, represented by SafeNames Ltd., United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Magic Spoon, United States of America ("United States").

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <byoma-skincare.com> is registered with Hosting Concepts B.V. d/b/a Registrar.eu. (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on April 22, 2026. On April 22, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On April 22, 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 (Whois Privacy Protection Foundation) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on April 24, 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 24, 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 29, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was May 19, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on May 21, 2026.

The Center appointed Igor Alfiorov as the sole panelist in this matter on May 28, 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, Byoma Limited, is a skincare brand founded in 2020 in Scotland, United Kingdom. The Complainant operates globally, specializing in skincare products for the face and body. The Complainant's products are sold online and in-store through major international beauty retailers. The Complainant has achieved significant commercial success, with reported sales in 2023 between USD 30-50 million, and maintains a substantial social media presence, especially on TikTok.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for the BYOMA mark worldwide, including:

- United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00003610176, registered on August 6, 2021, in Classes 3 and 35;
- European Union Trademark Registration No. 018443892, registered on October 14, 2021, in Classes 3 and 35; and
- United States Trademark Registration No. 6690108, registered on April 5, 2022, in Classes 3 and 35.

The disputed domain name was registered on September 11, 2025. Initially, the disputed domain name resolved to a website that displayed the Complainant's BYOMA trademark, logo, and product images, and operated as an online store that requested personal information from users during the checkout phase. Following a takedown request, the online store content was removed. Currently, the disputed domain name resolves to a parked webpage displaying commercial pay-per-click (PPC) advertising links with skincare-themed titles.

#### 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 BYOMA trademark, as it incorporates the mark in its entirety with the addition of the descriptive term "skincare" which directly refers to the Complainant's field of expertise.

The Complainant asserts that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because the Respondent is unauthorized to use the BYOMA trademark, is not commonly known by it, and has used the disputed domain name for deceptive commercial purposes. Specifically, the Complainant details that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to operate a copycat "fake shop" that replicated the Complainant's official logo and product images to harvest sensitive personal and financial data from consumers during a simulated checkout phase conduct that constitutes classic phishing. The Complainant contends that neither this deceptive credential-harvesting scheme nor the subsequent use of the disputed domain name to host commercial, skincare-themed PPC advertising links following the store's takedown can constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use under the Policy.

The Complainant submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Given the Complainant's active global presence, the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's mark. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to host a copycat store to harvest personal information (phishing) and subsequently to generate revenue through commercial PPC links capitalizing on the Complainant's mark exhibits clear bad faith under the Policy.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established rights in the BYOMA trademark through its registered trademarks.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's BYOMA trademark in its entirety. The addition of the term "skincare" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, as the Complainant's mark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The generic Top-Level Domain ".com" is a standard technical requirement and is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

### **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

The Complainant has established an un rebutted prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant, has not been licensed to use the BYOMA mark, and is not commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The record shows that the Respondent initially used the disputed domain name to operate a website mimicking the Complainant's logo, layout, and products to harvest sensitive checkout data from consumers. Under WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 2.13.1, panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, including here, claimed phishing, and copycat site, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent.

The subsequent use of the disputed domain name to host a parked page displaying commercial PPC links related to skincare products also does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate fair use as such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the Complainant's mark (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.9).

The Respondent has failed to provide any response or evidence to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Panel finds that the Respondent registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith.

The Complainant's BYOMA trademark is highly distinctive, recognizable and enjoys a well-established reputation internationally. Given that the Complainant's trademark registrations significantly predate the creation of the disputed domain name and that the Respondent immediately used the disputed domain name to host a copycat web store mimicking the Complainant's branding, it is inconceivable that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without knowledge of the Complainant's mark. This deliberate targeting of the Complainant's mark and business sector constitutes registration in bad faith.

The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to host a copycat website designed to deceive consumers into providing sensitive personal details under the guise of an implied affiliation with the Complainant represents a possibility of phishing, which is indicative of bad faith use.

Furthermore, after the removal of the copycat shopping website, the Respondent's continued use of the disputed domain name to display commercial skincare-related PPC links constitutes an intentional attempt to attract Internet users to its website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark, which satisfies the bad faith criteria under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel notes that the Respondent did not file a response or in any way contest the Complainant's serious claims of fraudulent activity and bad faith. This failure to participate in the proceeding, combined with the target-oriented registration and highly deceptive use of the disputed domain name, leads the Panel to conclude that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

## **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 <byoma-skincare.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Igor Alfiorov/*

**Igor Alfiorov**

Sole Panelist

Date: June 11, 2026