

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Byredo AB v. Lowe Claudia, LoweClaudia
Case No. D2026-1997

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Byredo AB, Sweden, represented by Zacco Sweden AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Lowe Claudia, LoweClaudia, Germany.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <byredoaustraliastore.com>, <byredobelgie.com>, <byredocanadastore.com>, <byredochile.com>, <byredodanmark.com>, <byredodeutschland.com>, <byredoespana.com>, <byredofrance.com>, <byredoindia.com>, <byredoireland.com>, <byredoisrael.com>, <byredoitalia.com>, <byredomalaysia.com>, <byredomexico.com>, <byredonederland.com>, <byredonorge.com>, <byredonz.com>, <byredophilippines.com>, <byredoportugal.com>, <byredoromania.com>, <byredosaudiArabia.com>, <byredoschweiz.com>, <byredosingapore.com>, <byredosouthafrica.com>, <byredosverige.com>, <byredoturkiye.com>, <byredouae.com>, <byredoukstore.com>, <byredousa.com> and <byredowien.com> are registered with CNOBIN Information Technology Limited (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 8, 2026. On May 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On May 9, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 11, 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 May 11, 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 May 19, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 10, 2026.

The Center appointed Dawn Osborne as the sole panelist in this matter on June 15, 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

Byredo, a European luxury brand founded in Stockholm in 2006 is the owner of the mark BYREDO, registered, inter alia, as international trade mark 966951 since February 8, 2008 for cosmetics, clothes and services relating to home furnishings.

The disputed domain names <byredoaustraliastore.com>, <byredocanadastore.com>, <byredoindia.com>, <byredoireland.com>, <byredomalaysia.com>, <byredonz.com>, <byredophilippines.com>, <byredosingapore.com>, <byredosouthafrica.com>, <byredouae.com>, <byredoukstore.com> and <byredousa.com> were registered on February 5, 2026.

The disputed domain names <byredobelgie.com>, <byredochile.com>, <byredodanmark.com>, <byredodeutschland.com>, <byredoespana.com>, <byredofrance.com>, <byredoisrael.com>, <byredoitalia.com>, <byredomexico.com>, <byredonederland.com>, <byredonorge.com>, <byredoportugal.com>, <byredoromania.com>, <byredosaudiarabia.com>, <byredoschweiz.com>, <byredosverige.com>, <byredoturkiye.com> and <byredowien.com> were registered on February 6, 2026.

All disputed domain names are being used for a site impersonating the Complainant using text and images from the Complainant's site and the Complainant's mark in its logo form as a masthead except for the disputed domain name <byredoukstore.com> which does not point to an active website.

The Respondent has given what appears to be a false physical address for the data registration details of the disputed domain names.

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.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

The disputed domain names are all confusingly similar to the Complainant's trade mark each containing it in its entirety and merely adding a generic geographical term and/or the dictionary word "store" and the generic Top Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" none of which prevents said confusing similarity between any of the disputed domain names and the Complainant's mark.

The Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names or any of them and is not authorised by the Complainant.

The web sites connected with the disputed domain names are being used to impersonate the Complainant by using text and images from the Complainant's site to mimic the look and feel of the Complainant's web site and © Byredo in footers. This is not a legitimate bona fide offering of goods or services or legitimate use. It is registration and use in fraudulent bad faith in full knowledge of the Complainant's rights.

The Respondent has been the subject of other adverse decisions under the UDRP relating to other third party trade mark owners showing a pattern of bad faith activity.

The Respondent has given a false physical address for the data registration details of the disputed domain names.

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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within all of 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 may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of the geographical terms in the disputed domain names and /or the dictionary word "store" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names (or any of them) 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.

The Respondent is not authorised by the Complainant or commonly known by the disputed domain names or any of them.

The Respondent is using all the disputed domain names (except for the disputed domain name <byredoukstore.com> which does not point to an active site) for a site impersonating the Complainant by using text and images from the Complainant's site and the Complainant's mark in its logo form as a masthead to purport to offer the Complainant's goods. This is confusing and is not a bona fide offering of goods or a legitimate non commercial fair use. Nor is the later non use of the disputed domain name <byredoukstore.com>.

Further Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, in the case of all the disputed domain names (except for the disputed domain name <byredoukstore.com>) 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, 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 is impersonating the Complainant using text and images from the Complainant's site and using the Complainant's mark in its logo form as a masthead for a site attached to all of the disputed domain names (except for the disputed domain name <byredoukstore.com> which does not point to an active site). For all of the active disputed domain names (i.e., all disputed domain names apart from the disputed domain name <byredoukstore.com>) the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract for commercial gain Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark and disrupting the Complainant's business.

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 illegal activity, namely 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 active disputed domain names (all disputed domain names except for the disputed domain name <byredoukstore.com>) constitute bad faith under the Policy.

Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name in this case of the disputed domain name <byredoukstore.com> would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness or reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name <byredoukstore.uk> which is a domain name with a risk of affiliation with the Complainant, the failure of the Respondent to submit a response or provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good faith use, the use of a false address and the many disputed domain names the Respondent has registered containing the

Complainant's mark which are being used to impersonate the Complainant plus the history of adverse unrelated UDRP decisions against the Respondent and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name <byredoukstore.com> does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Respondent has registered thirty disputed domain names, the subject of these proceedings, containing the Complainant's mark and has been the subject of other adverse decisions under the UDRP involving the trade marks of third parties indicating that the Respondent is engaging in a pattern of bad faith activity. See for example *GUESS?, Inc. v. Lowe Claudia*, WIPO Case No. [DMX2023-0046](#).

The provision of false physical address details for the data registration details of the disputed domain names is also an indication of bad faith per se.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy in relation to all the disputed domain names.

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 <byredoaustraliastore.com>, <byredobelgie.com>, <byredocanadastore.com>, <byredochile.com>, <byredodanmark.com>, <byredodeutschland.com>, <byredoespana.com>, <byredofrance.com>, <byredoindia.com>, <byredoireland.com>, <byredoisrael.com>, <byredoitalia.com>, <byredomalaysia.com>, <byredomexico.com>, <byredonederland.com>, <byredonorge.com>, <byredonz.com>, <byredophilippines.com>, <byredoportugal.com>, <byredoromania.com>, <byredosaudiarabia.com>, <byredoschweiz.com>, <byredosingapore.com>, <byredosouthafrica.com>, <byredosverige.com>, <byredoturkiye.com>, <byredouae.com>, <byredoukstore.com>, <byredousa.com> and <byredowien.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Dawn Osborne/

Dawn Osborne

Sole Panelist

Date: June 18, 2026