

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Elida Beauty US (IP) LLC v. manyu li
Case No. D2026-1972

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Elida Beauty US (IP) LLC, United States of America, represented by Stobbs IP Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is manyu li, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <alberto-balsam.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 7, 2026. On May 7, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 8, 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 (DT), Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 8, 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 May 13, 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 May 15, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 4, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 5, 2026.

The Center appointed Elise Dufour as the sole panelist in this matter on June 10, 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, Elida Beauty US (IP) LLC, is a limited liability company organized under the laws of the State of Delaware, United States of America. It forms part of the wider Elida Beauty group, which was established in 2021 following a carve-out from Unilever and which manages a portfolio of heritage beauty and personal care brands. In 2024, the Elida Beauty business was acquired by Yellow Wood Partners, and in January 2026 it combined with Suave Brands Company to form a personal care platform known as Evermark. The Complainant's brand portfolio includes the ALBERTO BALSAM brand, a haircare brand first launched in the 1950s and marketed, in particular, in the United Kingdom.

The Complainant is the owner of a number of registered trademarks for ALBERTO BALSAM, including the following:

- United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK00000981973, ALBERTO BALSAM (word), registered on October 19, 1971, in class 3;
- European Union trademark registration No. 008385825, ALBERTO BALSAM (word), registered on January 12, 2010, in class 3; and
- United Kingdom trademark registration No. UK00908385825, ALBERTO BALSAM (word), registered on January 12, 2010, in class 3.

The above trademark registrations are held in the name of the Complainant, Elida Beauty US (IP) LLC.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 27, 2026. It was registered through a privacy service.

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolves to an active website that presents itself as the official website of the ALBERTO BALSAM brand. The website reproduces the ALBERTO BALSAM mark, including together with the registered trademark symbol "®"; refers to the Complainant's actual product range (including its "Tea Tree Tingle", "Coconut & Lychee", "Juicy Green Apple" and "Sunkissed Raspberry" shampoos and conditioners); uses first-person wording such as "our products" and describes the brand as "the UK's trusted choice"; and includes a privacy policy and product listings. The Complainant states that the website also reproduces its copyright-protected images. The Respondent did not file a Response.

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.

In particular, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its ALBERTO BALSAM trademark, since it reproduces that mark in its entirety with the mere addition of a hyphen in place of the space between the two word elements and the addition of the ".com" Top-Level Domain; that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, in particular because the Respondent is using it to impersonate the Complainant and to offer goods under the Complainant's brand in a manner that is neither a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, and the Respondent has never been authorized by the Complainant nor commonly known by the disputed domain name; and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith, the Respondent having registered a domain name reflecting the Complainant's well-established mark with knowledge of the Complainant's rights and used it to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

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 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 entirety of the mark is reproduced 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.

The only differences between the disputed domain name and the mark are the replacement of the space between the two elements of the mark with a hyphen, which does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity, and the ".com" Top-Level Domain, which is a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 and 1.11.

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.

In particular, the disputed domain name resolves to a website that impersonates the Complainant. The website reproduces the ALBERTO BALSAM mark, uses the registered trademark symbol "®" in connection with the mark, refers to the Complainant's products as "our products", presents itself as the Complainant, and purports to offer goods under the Complainant's brand, all without any authorization from the Complainant. Such use, which is calculated to convey the false impression that the website is operated or authorized by the Complainant, does not amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services, nor to a

legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. There is, moreover, no indication that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

Panels have furthermore held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here impersonation and 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, which, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

The Complainant's ALBERTO BALSAM trademarks were registered, and the ALBERTO BALSAM brand has been marketed, long before the registration of the disputed domain name on January 27, 2026; the earliest registration relied upon dates from 1971. The content of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves – which reproduces the Complainant's mark and product range and presents itself as the Complainant – demonstrates that the Respondent was aware of, and deliberately targeted, the Complainant and its mark when registering the disputed domain name.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

By using the disputed domain name, which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark, to resolve to a website that impersonates the Complainant and purports to offer goods under the Complainant's brand, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of that website, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Panels have furthermore held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, here impersonation and 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 <alberto-balsam.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Elise Dufour/

Elise Dufour

Sole Panelist

Date: June 24, 2026