

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

**OBAGI HOLDINGS COMPANY LIMITED v. Adrian Hamilton, Howard Kova,
Clay Foy, Angel Daniels and Brayden Flores**
Case No. D2026-1910

1. The Parties

The Complainant is OBAGI HOLDINGS COMPANY LIMITED, United Kingdom, represented by MSA IP - Milojevic Sekulic & Associates, Serbia.

The Respondents are Adrian Hamilton, Howard Kova, Clay Foy, Angel Daniels, and Brayden Flores, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <getobagimedical.shop>, <obagimedicalstore.shop>, <theobagi.shop>, <buyobagimedical.shop> and <obagishop.shop> are registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 4, 2026, in relation to the disputed domain names <getobagimedical.shop>, <obagimedicalstore.shop> and <theobagi.shop>. On May 4, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with those disputed domain names. On May 6, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (NOT DISCLOSED) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 7, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on May 12, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 10, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on June 22, 2026.

The Complainant sent email communications on May 25, 2026, May 28, 2026, and June 8, 2026, requesting the addition of the disputed domain names <buyobagimedical.shop> and <obagishop.shop>. The Center notified the Parties that, because the request was received after the commencement of the proceeding, it would be for the Panel, once appointed, to determine whether to accept the addition of further domain names to the Complaint and whether to order any further procedural steps.

Due to a technical issue, the Written Notice of Complaint originally sent on May 21, 2026, was not sent to two of the available physical addresses. On June 24, 2026, the Center re-notified the Complaint and granted the Respondents five (5) additional days to submit a Response. The Respondents did not submit any response.

The Center appointed Pablo A. Palazzi as the sole panelist in this matter on July 1, 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.

As regards the Complainant's request for adding the disputed domain names <buyobagimedical.shop> and <obagishop.shop> into the current proceedings, the Center, under the instruction of the Panel, transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the additional disputed domain names on July 29 and 30, 2026. On July 30, 2026, and August 3, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the additional disputed domain names.

The Panel issued the Procedural Order providing the Registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, giving the Complainant additional time to amend the Complaint, as well as giving the Respondents additional time to respond to the Complainant's submission. On August 10, 2026, the Complainant submitted an amended Complaint requesting the consolidation of multiple Respondents. The Respondents did not file any submission.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a global skin products company founded in 1988.

The Complainant is the owner of several trademark registrations for or including OBAGI in more than 60 countries, including the following:

- International Trademark Registration No. 1495947A OBAGI, registered on July 31, 2019, in classes 3, 5, 35, 41, and 44; and
- International Trademark Registration No. 1592492A OBAGI MEDICAL, registered on March 29, 2021, in classes 3 and 35.

In addition, the Complainant operates the domain name <obagi.com>, which it uses for its website to promote its products and services.

The disputed domain names <getobagimedical.shop>, <obagimedicalstore.shop>, <theobagi.shop>, <buyobagimedical.shop> and <obagishop.shop> were registered on April 17, 2026, April 21, 2026, April 17, 2026, May 15, 2026 and May 27, 2026, respectively.

The disputed domain names resolve to websites that actively imitate the Complainant's official online store.

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 names.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Complainant's Request to add Additional Domain Names to the Current Proceeding

The Center received an amended Complaint from the Complainant requesting the addition of the disputed domain names <buyobagimedical.shop> and <obagishop.shop> (the "additional disputed domain names") after the Complaint had been notified to the Respondents and these proceedings have formally commenced.

In the amended Complaint, the Complainant included the additional disputed domain names which the Complainant alleged were newly discovered and registered by the same Respondent. The Respondents did not file any Response.

In accordance with the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#)), section 4.12.2, a request for addition of domain names to a complaint after it has been notified to the respondent and the proceedings have formally commenced are generally not encouraged – in particular given the potential to delay the case. Those requests would be addressed by the Panel on appointment.

In those cases where panels would grant such a request, the complainant would need to hold relevant trademark rights and the proposed additional domain name would need to be prima facie registered by the same or related respondent. Moreover, in the event a panel grants such a request, it may also order partial or full re-notification of the proceeding (which would extend the case timelines).

In the present case, although denying the Complainant's request would not prevent the Complainant from filing a separate complaint for the additional disputed domain names, the Panel is mindful that cybersquatting often involves bulk registrations within a short time frame that can overlap with the commencement of the proceedings. This practice makes it difficult for trademark owners to detect all infractions and include them in an initial complaint. While re-notification causes a minimal delay, this is preferable to requiring the Complainant to initiate a separate proceeding, especially since—as it will be noted below—all the disputed domain names reflect a common pattern of registration.

In particular, the Panel notes that:

- (i) the Complainant holds relevant trademark rights in respect of the additional disputed domain names;
- (ii) the proposed additional disputed domain names appear to be prima facie registered by the same Respondent (see section 6.2 below); and
- (iii) the factual and legal grounds underlying the additional disputed domain names are substantially the same as those already at issue in the current proceeding, such that its inclusion would promote procedural efficiency and consistency of outcome.

Accordingly, the Complainant's request to add the additional disputed domain names to the current proceeding is granted.

6.2. Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaints were filed in relation to nominally different disputed domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the disputed domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that:

- The disputed domain names were registered between April and May 2026;
- All disputed domain names are registered with the same Registrar;
- All disputed domain names resolve to websites with similar content – online shops offering heavily discounted OBAGI products of unknown origin;
- All disputed domain names are within the “.shop” generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”);
- The websites to which disputed domain names resolve are hosted by the same service provider; and
- The Respondent data appears fabricated, and follows a similar structure strongly suggesting that the data has been generated by the same entity.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as “the Respondent”) in a single proceeding.

6.3. Substantive elements

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 names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms here “get”, “medical”, “store”, “the”, “buy” “shop” may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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 names. 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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed copycat sites, passing off, or other types of fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The composition of the disputed domain names - including the use of the trademark alongside words related to the Complainant’s business (e.g., “medical”, “shop”, among others) - and the content of the resolving websites mimicking an online store of the Complainant, carries a risk of implied affiliation to the Complainant and, as such, cannot constitute fair use. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), Section 2.5.1.

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 registered the disputed domain names in 2026, whereas the Complainant had already established prior use of the trademark for several years.
- The Respondent registered within a short period of time a total of five (5) disputed domain names, each incorporating the Complainant’s trademark alongside the dictionary terms or terms which directly relates to the Complainant’s business and website, showing knowledge of the Complainant.
- The Panel visited the five disputed domain names and was able to verify that each of them resolves to an online retail website that prominently displays the Complainant’s registered trademark OBAGI MEDICAL, including a logo, its trade dress, and official product imagery. In addition, the Panel has verified that the websites offer for sale a range of skincare products under the Complainant’s brand at prices that are substantially discounted from retail without any indication of authorization by the Complainant. The sites falsely present themselves as official or authorized sources, using titles such as “Official Obagi Medical”, “Official Site | Professional Science-Based Skincare”, and similar sentences.
- The Respondent has failed to submit a Response and is in default.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for activities such as passing off or similar behavior constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

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 names <getobagimedical.shop>, <obagimedicalstore.shop>, <theobagi.shop>, <buyobagimedical.shop> and <obagishop.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Pablo A. Palazzi/

Pablo A. Palazzi

Sole Panelist

Date: August 21, 2026.