

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Hairitage IP LLC v. Dantangchun

Case No. D2026-2207

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Hairitage IP LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Dorf Nelson & Zauderer LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Dantangchun, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <hairitage-hair.com> (the "Domain Name") is registered with Bangning Digital Technology Co.,Ltd (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on May 21, 2026. On May 22, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Name. On May 25, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Name which differed from the named Respondent (hairitage-hair.com, Bangning Digital Technology Co.,Ltd) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 26, 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 27, 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 June 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 22, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on June 23, 2026.

The Center appointed Ian Lowe as the sole panelist in this matter on June 29, 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 a United States based corporation that owns the HAIRITAGE brand which its exclusive licensee launched in December 2019 in conjunction with the well-known influencer and hair stylist Mindy McKnight. HAIRITAGE offerings comprise a range of hair care and skin care products and associated accessories. These are available at the Complainant's website at "www.hairitagebymindy.com". The products were first launched at Walmart, and the brand has now become very well-known with thousands of followers on YouTube, Instagram and TikTok.

The Complainant is the proprietor of a number of registered trademarks in respect of HAIRITAGE including United States trademark number 6035620 HAIRITAGE registered on April 14, 2020, and International trademark number 1678427 HAIRITAGE registered on July 14, 2022.

The Domain Name was registered on May 6, 2026. It resolves to a website prominently featuring the Complainant's HAIRITAGE mark and a copy of the "HAIRITAGE by Mindy McKnight" and device block used by the Complainant on its website. The Respondent's website appears to be impersonating the Complainant and purports to offer for sale a wide range of HAIRITAGE branded products at significantly discounted prices. The website provides no information as to the identity of the operator of the site. It features photographs of HAIRITAGE products and images of Mindy McKnight and her children.

5. Parties' Contentions

The Complainant contends that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to its HAIRITAGE trademark (the "Mark"), that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name, and that the Respondent registered and is using the Domain Name in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

For this Complaint to succeed in relation to the Domain Name the Complainant must prove that:

- (i) the Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights;
- (ii) the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name; and
- (iii) the Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

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 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.

Ignoring the generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com”, the Domain Name comprises the entirety of the Mark with the addition of a hyphen and the word “hair”. The Panel finds that these additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Name and the Mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights, and 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 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. Accordingly, 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.

The Complainant has made out a strong prima facie case that the Respondent could have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name. The Respondent has used the Domain Name not in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, but for a website impersonating the Complainant, featuring the Mark and images of the Complainant’s products and purporting to offer for sale the Complainant’s branded products at substantially discounted prices.

UDRP panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (such as impersonation or passing off) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

There is no suggestion that the Respondent has ever been known by the Domain Name. The Respondent has chosen not to respond to the Complainant or to take any steps to counter the prima facie case established by the Complainant. In the circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent does not have any rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name.

In addition, the nature of the Domain Name together with the website at the Domain Name creates a strong risk of Internet user confusion.

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 light of the nature of the Domain Name, incorporating the entirety of the Mark, and the Respondent’s use of its website to impersonate the Complainant, the Panel is in no doubt that the Respondent had the Complainant and its rights in the Mark in mind when it registered the Domain Name.

The Panel is satisfied that the Respondent has registered and, as set out above, used the Domain Name to impersonate the Complainant and to deceive Internet users into believing that the Domain Name is operated or authorized by the Complainant, attracting Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Mark. In the Panel's view, the use of a domain name for such activity, clearly with a view to commercial gain, amounts to paradigm bad faith registration and use for the purposes of the Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

Moreover, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (such as impersonation or passing off) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

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 Domain Name <hairitage-hair.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Ian Lowe/

Ian Lowe

Sole Panelist

Date: July 13, 2026