

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Byoma Limited v. lar frank, no
Case No. D2026-2337

1. The Parties

Complainant is Byoma Limited, United Kingdom, represented by SafeNames Ltd., United Kingdom.

Respondent is lar frank, no, Philippines.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <byomabest.com>, <byomacare.com>, <byomadepot.com> and <byomausmall.com> are registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 29, 2026 regarding the disputed domain name <byomausmall.com>. On June 1, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name <byomausmall.com>. On June 1, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name <byomausmall.com> which differed from named Respondent (User #c6db7878 Privacy / See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on June 3, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint and requested to add the disputed domain names <byomabest.com>, <byomacare.com>, and <byomadepot.com> to the proceeding on June 4, 2026.

On June 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names <byomabest.com>, <byomacare.com>, and <byomadepot.com>. On June 5, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the registrant details are the same as those for the disputed domain name <byomausmall.com>.

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 9, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 29, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on July 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Gabriel F. Leonardos as the sole panelist in this matter on July 16, 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

Complainant is a Scottish skincare brand founded in 2020. Operating under the brand name BYOMA, it is one of the many brands under the parent company Bansk Group.

Complainant’s products are sold internationally, including the United Kingdom, the United States of America (“United States”), Asia and Europe, and have been launched in stores and online at renowned beauty retailers. Also, Complainant has received recognition in the beauty industry, featuring in multiple beauty magazines as well as earning several awards.

As shown in the examples below, Complainant owns several trademark registrations for BYOMA:

Registration Number	Trademark	Jurisdiction	International Class(es)	Registration Date
2167020	BYOMA	Australia	3 and 35	March 29, 2021
UK00003610176	BYOMA	United Kingdom	3 and 35	August 6, 2021
018443892	BYOMA	European Union	3 and 35	October 14, 2021
1633315	BYOMA	International	3	November 2, 2021
6690108	BYOMA	United States	3 and 35	April 5, 2022
018722696	BYOMA	European Union	3	October 21, 2022

Complainant owns domain names containing the BYOMA trademark, such as <byoma.com>, which resolves to the company’s main website. Also, Complainant established a social media presence with the BYOMA trademark, using accounts in Facebook, Instagram and TikTok with the trademark.

The disputed domain names have been registered on the following dates:

Domain name	Registration date
<byomacare.com>	March 31, 2026
<byomadepot.com>	April 1, 2026
<byomausmall.com>	April 11, 2026
<byomabest.com>	April 28, 2026

All disputed domain names are now inactive and do not resolve to active webpages, but all of them were previously used to display online store websites impersonating Complainant and purportedly offering Complainant's products for sale.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain names.

Notably, Complainant contends that the disputed domain names reproduce the BYOMA trademark in its entirety with the mere addition of either the geographical identifier "us" (for the United States) or industry-specific terms such as "mall", "depot", "care", or "best". Therefore, according to Complainant, the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to Complainant's trademarks, fulfilling paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.

Complainant affirms that Respondent is not known by the disputed domain names and was not authorized to use Complainant's trademarks in any way. Accordingly, there are no circumstances that justify Respondent's registration of the disputed domain names, especially when considering its apparent intention to divert and confuse Internet users into believing that Respondent is associated with Complainant's business, through the use of the BYOMA trademark and Complainant's logo on the previous websites at the disputed domain names. Therefore, Complainant states that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, fulfilling paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

Also, Complainant asserts that the disputed domain names were registered in bad faith. Complainant affirms that Respondent must have been aware of Complainant's reputation and trademark at the time of registration of the disputed domain names, especially considering the renown of the BYOMA mark and the use of Complainant's mark on the previous websites at the disputed domain names.

According to Complainant, Respondent has failed to demonstrate any legitimate use of the disputed domain names. On the contrary, Respondent was intentionally attempting to attract Internet users and obtain commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with Complainant's trademarks, falsely advertising Complainant's goods through the disputed domain names.

Finally, Complainant contends that Respondent has engaged in a pattern of abusive conduct by registering numerous domain names that encompass the BYOMA trademark, noting that Respondent has already been subject to previous UDRP proceedings involving the BYOMA trademark which ended with transfer decisions.

Thus, according to Complainant, the requirements for bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain names have been fulfilled, pursuant to paragraphs 4(a)(iii) and 4(b) of the Policy.

Accordingly, Complainant requests that the disputed domain names be transferred to Complainant.

B. Respondent

Respondent did not reply to Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

To succeed in a UDRP complaint, Complainant must demonstrate that all the elements listed in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy have been satisfied, as following:

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

The burden of proving these elements is upon Complainant.

Respondent had 20 days to submit a response in accordance with paragraph 5(a) of the Rules and failed to do so. Paragraph 5(f) of the Rules establishes that if a respondent does not respond to the complaint, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the panel's decision shall be based upon the complaint.

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 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.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds 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 BYOMA trademark is reproduced 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 the terms "us", "mall", "depot", "care" or "best" may bear assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that such terms do 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. Also, in this sense, see *LEGO Holding A/S v. John Bau dk*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-4362](#); *Advance Magazine Publishers Inc. v. Arena International Inc.*, WIPO Case No. [D2011-0203](#); and *ELO v. Albert Poussin*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3638](#).

Therefore, based on the available record, 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 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. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to 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 Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names. Respondent has not rebutted 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.

Based on the available record, Respondent is not entitled to any trademark, trade name, or any other right associated with the disputed domain names. Additionally, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, Respondent is not commonly known by the disputed domain names and has not been authorized by Complainant to use the BYOMA trademark, and there is no commercial relationship between the Parties.

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

In light of these circumstances, the Panel finds that no rights or legitimate interests can be found on behalf of Respondent.

Accordingly, 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 Respondent has registered the disputed domain names that are confusingly similar to Complainant's BYOMA trademark. Also, based on the available record, it has been established that Respondent has no affiliation with Complainant and its trademarks, nor has it sought authorization or a license to utilize the referred trademarks. Also, Respondent does not own any trademarks containing the term "Byoma" or showed any rights over the trademarks or any related terms in the disputed domain names.

Respondent evidently knew or should have known of the existence of Complainant's prior trademark rights and domain name, which were matters of public record, before registering the disputed domain names. The registration of the disputed domain names was carried out by Respondent, who could have run a search to verify the existence of the referred trademark.

Considering Complainant's activities, the composition of the disputed domain names, and prior use of the disputed domain names for websites impersonating Complainant, it may be inferred that the registration and use of the disputed domain names has been done with the intention to take advantage of the BYOMA trademark and attract Internet users to Respondent's websites for commercial gain.

As stated and shown in the Complaint (Annex 10 of the Amended Complaint), the websites linked to the disputed domain names featured Complainant's trademark and logo, mimicked the layout of Complainant's website, and purportedly offering Complainant's products on heavily discounted prices (suggesting the possibility of counterfeit products). Previous panels have already recognized bad faith in the registration of domain names composed by registered trademarks and aimed at the commercialization of replicas of the trademark owner's products, such as in *Hermes International v. Yue Wang*, WIPO Case No. [D2020-1163](#), and *Bulgari S.p.A v. Giuseppe Daniele*, WIPO Case No. [DCC2025-0019](#).

Furthermore, Respondent has been found to be involved in prior trademark-abusive domain name registrations, even involving the BYOMA trademark (e.g., *Byoma Limited v. no, lar frank*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-1010](#); and *Byoma Limited v. no, lar frank*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-0696](#)).

In the view of the Panel, this behavior demonstrates a pattern of conduct by Respondent and further supports the finding of Respondent's bad faith. UDRP panels have held that establishing a pattern of bad faith conduct requires more than one, but as few as two instances of abusive domain name registration, see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.2.

Therefore, based on the available record, the Panel finds that 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 <byomabest.com>, <byomacare.com>, <byomadepot.com>, and <byomausmall.com> be transferred to Complainant.

/Gabriel F. Leonardos/

Gabriel F. Leonardos

Sole Panelist

Date: July 30, 2026