

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Victoria Beckham c/o Lee & Thompson LLP v. 杨燕梅 (yangyanmei,
yang yanmei)

Case No. D2026-2513

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is 杨燕梅 (yangyanmei, yang yanmei), China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <victoriabeckhamdanmark.com>, <victoriabeckhamireland.com>, <victoriabeckhamnederland.com>, <victoriabeckhamnewzealand.com>, <victoriabeckhamnorge.com>, <victoriabeckhamportugal.com>, <victoriabeckhamschweiz.com>, <victoriabeckhamturkiye.com> and <victoriabeckhamuk.com> (the “Domain Names”) are 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 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 12, 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) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 12, 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 June 17, 2026.

The Center verified that 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 22, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 12, 2026. The Respondent 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 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 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 on April 29, 2026. Evidence shows that the Disputed Domain Names resolve to near identical websites which imitate the Complainant's official site and prominently display the Complainant's mark, and offer goods purporting to be VICTORIA BECKHAM products. The Complainant has documented that the Respondent's websites feature the Complainant's copyright material. The Respondent's websites provide a login facility that enables Internet users to input personal login data. The main difference between the Respondent's websites is their language. According to the evidence on file, access to the website at the domain name <victoriabeckhamturkiye.com> was blocked at the time of filing of the Complaint; at the time of this Decision, it resolves to an online store with the same layout.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

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 local identifiers. The adornments do nothing to distinguish the disputed domain names from the Complainant's trademark. The Complainant contends that the adornments achieve the opposite, as they create false impression that the Domain Names are the Complainant's official regional websites for relevant countries.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Names. The Complainant has not licensed or authorized the Respondent to use its trademark. The Complainant has found no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known as VICTORIA BECKHAM. The Complainant has found no evidence that the Respondent owns 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 Respondent. The Complainant further notes that 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 or consent from the Complainant, and the Respondent's websites do not disclose their relationship to the Complainant. On the contrary, the Respondent's websites attempt to mislead Internet users into believing that the Respondent's websites are authorized or endorsed by the Complainant.

The Complainant argues that the Respondent has 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 Respondent does not display any kind of disclaimer and has not undertaken any reasonable steps to avoid confusion between it and the Complainant. Moreover, the Complainant notes that the Respondent is operating a login portal on its websites, requesting data from Internet users.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed 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 the additions of country names or county codes. 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 Complainant's products.

The Respondent has no permission and the Respondent's websites do not disclose their relationship to the Complainant. The Respondent's use is evidence of bad faith, see below. The composition of the Domain Names, coupled with their use, carries a risk of affiliation. [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 the 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 the Policy.

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 <victoriabeckhamdanmark.com>, <victoriabeckhamireland.com>, <victoriabeckhamnederland.com>, <victoriabeckhamnewzealand.com>, <victoriabeckhamnorge.com>, <victoriabeckhamportugal.com>, <victoriabeckhamschweiz.com>, <victoriabeckhamturkiye.com> and <victoriabeckhamuk.com> transferred to the Complainant.

/Mathias Lilleengen/

Mathias Lilleengen

Sole Panelist

Date: July 21, 2026