

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Byoma Limited v. YE DU
Case No. D2026-2133

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Byoma Limited, United Kingdom ("UK"), represented by SafeNames Ltd., United Kingdom.

The Respondent is YE DU, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <byoma.shop> is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 18, 2026. On May 18, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 18, 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 and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 19, 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 21, 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 28, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 17, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 18, 2026.

The Center appointed Jonas Gulliksson as the sole panelist in this matter on June 24, 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 is Byoma Limited, a skincare brand founded in 2020 in Scotland, UK.

The Complainant is the owner of several BYOMA trademarks in classes 3 and 35 (Annex 7 of the Complaint), including:

- Australian trademark registration No 2167020, registered on March 29, 2021,
- United Kingdom trademark registration No UK00003610176, registered on August 6, 2021,
- European Union trademark registration No 018443892, registered on October 14, 2021, and
- United States of America registration No 6690108, registered on April 5, 2022.

The Complainant has an official website at “www.byoma.com”.

The disputed domain name was registered on November 6, 2025. At the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name redirected traffic to the Registrar’s website, where it was listed for sale.

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.

First, the Complainant argues that the disputed domain name is identical to the Complainant’s BYOMA mark. In this regard, the Complainant submits that the Top-Level Domain “.shop” featured in the disputed domain name be disregarded.

Secondly, the Complainant asserts that it has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. To the best of the Complainant’s knowledge, the Respondent does not hold any trademark rights in the term “byoma”. There is likewise no evidence that the Respondent has acquired unregistered trademark rights in the term “byoma”. The Respondent has not been licensed or otherwise authorized by the Complainant to use domain names incorporating the BYOMA trademark. The Complainant further submits that the Respondent uses the disputed domain name to redirect to the aftermarket website, where the disputed domain name is listed for sale. The Complainant contends that the Respondent is not, and has never been, commonly known by the term “byoma” or any similar designation. In the Complainant’s view, there is no plausible reason for the registration and use of the disputed domain name other than to take unfair advantage of the goodwill and reputation associated with the Complainant’s BYOMA mark.

Thirdly, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant notes that its trademarks predate the registration of the disputed domain name by more than four years. In light of the alleged reputation and recognition of the Complainant’s BYOMA mark, the Complainant argues that the Respondent must have been aware of the BYOMA mark when registering the disputed domain name. In this regard, the Complainant also refers to a cease-and desist letter which was sent to the Respondent on April 8, 2026, which, according to the Complainant, the Respondent chose to ignore. Furthermore, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in bad faith prior to notice of the Complaint by redirecting it to the domain aftermarket website, where the disputed domain name is listed for sale. The Complainant therefore asserts that the Respondent registered

the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of selling it to the Complainant or to one of its competitors.

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 Complainant's BYOMA mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. The Top-Level Domain of the disputed domain name, in this case ".shop", may be disregarded for the purposes of assessment under the first element, as it is viewed as a standard registration requirement. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

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.

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.

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.

The Panel finds the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark. Furthermore, the Panel finds that the Respondent knew or should have known the Complainant's trademark and registered the disputed domain name for the purpose of taking unfair advantage of the Complainant's reputation.

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 <byoma.shop> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Jonas Gulliksson/

Jonas Gulliksson

Sole Panelist

Date: July 7, 2026