

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Victoria Beckham c/o Lee & Thompson LLP v. Risawa Atsutomu, jakemanb jakemanb, huapusjmn huapusjmn
Case No. D2026-2512

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Victoria Beckham c/o Lee & Thompson LLP, United Kingdom, represented by Com Laude Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondents are Risawa Atsutomu, United States of America ("United States"), jakemanb jakemanb, United States, and huapusjmn huapusjmn, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The Domain Names <shopvictoriabeckhambeauty.shop>, <victoriabeckhambeautyhq.shop>, <victoriabeckhamhq.shop>, and <victoriabeckhamstudio.shop> (the "Domain Names") are registered with Spaceship, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 10, 2026. On June 10, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Names. On June 11, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the Domain Names which differed from the named Respondent (Redacted for Privacy Purposes Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 12, 2026 with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the Domain Names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all Domain Names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on June 17, 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 12, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on July 20, 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 to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a British singer, fashion designer, television personality. The Complainant launched her own label in 2008. In 2024, the label reported revenues of GBP 112.7 million. In 2019, the Complainant founded her beauty dedicated "Victoria Beckham Beauty" brand, offering makeup, skincare and fragrances. The Complainant's products are available online, as well as in around 230 department stores across 50 countries worldwide. The Complainant operates her commercial websites at "www.victoriabeckham.com" and "www.victoriabeckhambeauty.com".

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for VICTORIA BECKHAM, such as United Kingdom trademark registration no. UK00902543320 (registered on January 22, 2007).

The Domain Names have been registered in the period between January 24, 2026, and March 21, 2026. Evidence shows that three Domain Names resolve to similar websites at different stages of completion. The websites have the look and feel of the Complainant's genuine websites and feature the Complainant's copyright material, including product names, descriptions and photographs. The Respondents' websites provide a login facility that enables Internet users to input personal login data. None of the websites clarify, by way of disclaimer or otherwise, that they have no relationship with the Complainant. The fourth Domain Name, <victoriabeckhambeautyhq.shop>, does not resolve to an active website, but to an error page.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant argues that the Domain Names are under common control of the same person or entity. The Domain Names appear to target the Complainant by reflecting her trademark within the Domain Names. The Domain Names were registered with the same Registrar within two months of each other, and use the same Whois privacy service. Three disputed domain names use the same nameserver (NS) records, and are configured with A-records owned by the same hosting provider. Three disputed domain names resolve to similar websites. Two revealed registrant contact details share the same address.

The Complainant documents registered trademark rights in VICTORIA BECKHAM. She has successfully defended her trademark rights under the UDRP before, such as in *Victoria Beckham v. Tie Bor, hao ming, song lin, d's'da's'da's'd dasd, KentLorenz MJDNAH, ou oudi*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3991](#). The Domain Names incorporate the Complainant's VICTORIA BECKHAM name and mark combined with generic terms, namely "hq" (likely representing an abbreviation for headquarters), "studio", "shop" and "beauty". The Complainant contends that the adornments do nothing to distinguish the Domain Names from the Complainant's trademark, but only achieve the opposite, as they create false impression that the Domain Names are the Complainant's official online shops.

The Complainant argues that the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Names. The Complainant has not licensed or authorized the Respondents to use its trademark.

The Complainant has found no evidence that the Respondents have been commonly known as VICTORIA BECKHAM. The Complainant has found no evidence that the Respondents own any marks incorporating the term “victoria beckham”. The Complainant contends that given that the Domain Names are confusingly similar to her name and mark, there is no conceivable use to which they could be put that would confer any legitimate interest upon the Respondents. The Complainant further notes that the Respondents cannot claim to make any fair use as a reseller, distributor, or service provider of the Complainant’s products. The Respondents have no permission or consent from the Complainant, and the Respondents’ websites do not disclose their relationship to the Complainant. On the contrary, the Respondents’ websites attempt to mislead Internet users into believing that they are authorized or endorsed by the Complainant. Moreover, the Domain Names carries a risk of implied affiliation. The Complainant argues that even if the Respondents were genuine resellers of the Complainant’s products, the Respondents cannot claim nominative fair use as reseller or distributor as described in section 2.8 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (“[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)”).

The Complainant argues that the Respondents have registered the Domain Names merely to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the name and trademark of the Complainant. The Complainant underlines that the Respondents are impersonating the Complainant and the Respondents’ websites do not display any kind of disclaimer and have not undertaken any reasonable steps to avoid confusion between them and the Complainant. Moreover, the Complainant notes that the Respondents are operating a login portal on the websites, requesting data from Internet users. The Complainant notes that the Domain Name <victoriabeckhambeautyhq.shop> appears not to have resolved to any websites. As such, the Complainant asserts that such passive holding of this domain name constitutes bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding, see section 3.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#).

B. Respondents

The Respondents did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Preliminary Issue: Consolidation

The Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant argues that the domain name registrants are the same entity or under common control. The Complainant requests consolidation of the disputes against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules. Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder. In addressing the Complainant’s request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.11.2.

As regards the common control, the Panel notes that the Domain Names appear to target the Complainant. The Domain Names were registered within a short time span with the same Registrar, using the same Whois privacy service. Three Domain Names use the same nameserver (NS) records, are configured with A-records owned by the same hosting provider and resolve to similar websites. Moreover, two revealed registrant contact details share the same address. This points to the fact that the Domain Names are under common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party. The different domain name registrants have not objected to the Complainant’s consolidation request.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different Domain Name registrants (referred to as “the Respondent”) in a single proceeding.

6.2. Substantive Issues

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the Domain Names. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has established registered trademark rights in VICTORIA BECKHAM. The Domain Names incorporate the Complainant's trademark, with additions such as "hq", "studio", "shop" and "beauty". The additions do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Names and the trademark. For the purpose of assessing the confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel may disregard the Top-Level Domains. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.

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 the respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name. While 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 often impossible 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. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. The Respondent is not affiliated with or related to the Complainant. There is no evidence that the Respondent has registered the Domain Names as a trademark or acquired trademark rights. There is no evidence of the Respondent's use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the Domain Names or names corresponding to the Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The Respondent cannot claim to make any fair use as a reseller, distributor, or service provider of the Complainant's products. The Respondent has no permission and the Respondent's websites do not disclose their relationship with the Complainant. The Respondent's use is evidence of bad faith, see below. The composition of the Domain Names carries a risk of affiliation with the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1.

Based on the available record, 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.

The composition and use of the Domain Names prove that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant when the Respondent registered them. The use of three Domain Names for unauthorized sale of the Complainant's products, without disclosing the Respondent's lack of relationship with the trademark owner, is clear evidence of bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. As for the non-used Domain Name <victoriabeckhambeautyhq.shop>, passive holding of this Domain Name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding, see section 3.3 of the [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), as the Complainant's trademark is reputed, the Respondent has failed to provide any evidence of actual or contemplated good-faith use, but rather concealed its identity and passed off the Complainant.

For the reasons set out above, the Panel concludes that the Domain Names were registered and are being used in bad faith, within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

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 the Domain Names <shopvictoriabeckhambeauty.shop>, <victoriabeckhambeautyhq.shop>, <victoriabeckhamhq.shop>, and <victoriabeckhamstudio.shop> transferred to the Complainant.

/Mathias Lilleengen/

Mathias Lilleengen

Sole Panelist

Date: July 27, 2026