

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Huda Beauty Limited v. Jean Lancelot
Case No. D2026-2539

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Huda Beauty Limited, British Virgin Islands, United Kingdom, represented by Rouse Consultancy (Shanghai) Ltd., China.

The Respondent is Jean Lancelot, Germany.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <hudabeautycanada.com> (the “Disputed Domain Name”) is registered with Mat Bao Corporation (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 11, 2026. On June 11, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name, followed by reminders on June 17, 2026, and June 23, 2026. On June 25, 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 (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 25, 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 the same day.

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 July 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 23, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 29, 2026.

The Center appointed Douglas M. Isenberg as the sole panelist in this matter on July 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 states that it "was founded in 2013 by award-winning beauty blogger Huda Kattan"; that "[b]eginning as a blog in 2010, Huda Beauty is one of the world's fastest-growing beauty brands and a leading beauty influencer in the world with over 57 million Instagram followers, 7.7 million Facebook followers, and 4.17 million YouTube followers"; that it "sells more than 100 products in over 50 countries and more than 1,200 retail stores offering an entire range of cosmetics, skincare and fragrance"; and that "[i]n 2025, the Complainant has been named as the most popular beauty brand for the first quarter of the year by Cosmetics Business."

The Complainant further states that it "registered [the] domain name <hudabeauty.com> on April 3, 2010, and has been using it as [its] official website since then for [its] HUDABEAUTY business."

The Complainant further states, and provides documentation in support thereof, that it is the owner of registrations for HUDABEAUTY in "numerous countries and regions, including European Union, United Kingdom, United Arab Emirates, United States [of America], Russia[n] [Federation], Australia, Singapore, Mexico, New Zealand, and Switzerland." Specifically, the Complainant's registrations include the following:

- Australia Reg. No. 1806380 for HUDABEAUTY (registered March 20, 2017) for use in connection with, inter alia, "beauty and hair care services";
- United States of America. Reg. No. 5,459,220 for HUDABEAUTY (registered May 1, 2018) for use in connection with, inter alia, "perfumery, essential oils, cosmetics, hair lotions"; and
- European Union Reg. No. 015755549 for HUDABEAUTY (registered December 19, 2016) for use in connection with, inter alia, "beauty and hair care services".

The above registrations are referred to herein as the "HUDABEAUTY Trademark."

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on December 20, 2025. As stated in the Complaint, and as supported by appropriate documentation, the Disputed Domain Name is used in connection with a website that "is prominently displaying the Complainant's HUDABEAUTY trademark and is using the Complainant's HUDABEAUTY trademark in relation to the purported sale of the Complainant's HUDABEAUTY cosmetic products and its successor in title's KAYALI perfumes"; and "the majority of the product images displayed on the website associated with the Disputed Domain Name, if not all of them, are directly copied from the Complainant's official website."

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. Notably, the Complainant contends in relevant part that:

- The Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the HUDABEAUTY Trademark because “[t]he dominant component of the Disputed Domain Name is ‘hudabeautycanada’, which incorporates the Complainant’s HUDABEAUTY trademark in its entirety and the geographical term ‘canada’”; and “[i]t is long-established in UDRP precedents that mere addition of a term such as ‘canada’ does not prevent the Disputed Domain Name from being confusingly similar to the Complainant’s HUDABEAUTY trademark.”
- The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name because “[t]o the best knowledge of the Complainant, the Respondent does not have any trademark rights corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name”; “[t]he Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant in any way”; “[t]he Complainant has never authorized or licensed the Respondent to use the HUDABEAUTY trademark in any manner, including registering domain names incorporating the famous HUDABEAUTY trademark”; “[t]here is no evidence indicating that the Respondent has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name”; and the website using the Disputed Domain Name “give[s] the impression that it is an official or authorized website of the Complainant.”
- The Respondent registered and is using the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith because the Respondent’s use of the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a website “prominently displaying the Complainant’s HUDABEAUTY trademark, the Complainant’s copyrighted product images from the Complainant’s official website and purportedly offering the Complainant’s HUDABEAUTY cosmetic products and its successor in title’s KAYALI perfumes ... creates a false impression of affiliation with the Complainant and disrupts the Complainant’s business.”

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

Based upon the trademark registrations cited by the Complainant, it is apparent that the Complainant has rights in and to the HUDABEAUTY Trademark.

As to whether the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the HUDABEAUTY Trademark, the relevant comparison to be made is with the Second-Level portion of the Disputed Domain Name only (i.e., “hudabeautycanada”) because “[t]he applicable Top Level Domain (‘TLD’) in a domain name (e.g., ‘.com’, ‘.club’, ‘.nyc’) is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element confusing similarity test”. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)), section 1.11.1.

As set forth in section 1.7 of [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), “in cases where a domain name incorporates the entirety of a trademark, ... the domain name will normally be considered confusingly similar to that mark.” Further, as set forth in section 1.8 of [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), “[w]here the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms (whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise) would not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element.” Here, the Disputed Domain Name contains the entirety of the HUDABEAUTY Trademark, and the addition of the geographical word “canada” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

The Complainant has argued that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name because, inter alia, “[t]o the best knowledge of the Complainant, the Respondent does not have any trademark rights corresponding to the Disputed Domain Name”; “[t]he Respondent is not sponsored by or affiliated with the Complainant in any way”; “[t]he Complainant has never authorized or licensed the Respondent to use the HUDABEAUTY trademark in any manner, including registering domain names incorporating the famous HUDABEAUTY trademark”; “[t]here is no evidence indicating that the Respondent has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name”; and the website using the Disputed Domain Name “give[s] the impression that it is an official or authorized website of the Complainant.”

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1, states: “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 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.”

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established its prima facie case and without any evidence from the Respondent to the contrary, the Panel is satisfied that Complainant has satisfied the second element of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Whether a domain name is registered and used in bad faith for purposes of the Policy may be determined by evaluating four (non-exhaustive) factors set forth in the Policy: (i) circumstances indicating that the registrant has registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant who is the owner of the trademark or service mark or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the registrant’s documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or (ii) the registrant has registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trademark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the registrant has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or (iii) the registrant has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or (iv) by using the domain name, the registrant has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the registrant’s website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the registrant’s website or location or of a product or service on the registrant’s website or location. Policy, paragraph 4(b).

By using the Disputed Domain Name in connection with a website that appears to be a website for, or associated with, the Complainant, the Respondent has clearly created a likelihood of confusion, which constitutes bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. See, e.g., *The Dow Chemical Company v. dowychemical eva_hwang@21cn.com +86.7508126859*, WIPO Case No. [D2008-1078](#) (finding bad faith where complainant alleged that respondent’s website “fraudulently impersonat[ed] the Complainant” because “[t]he Respondent was clearly specifically targeting the Complainant’s trademark and attempting to divert Internet users searching for the Complainant’s product to the Respondent’s website”); *Emu (Aus) Pty Ltd. and Emu Ridge Holdings Pty Ltd. v. Antonia Deinert*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-1390](#) (“a reasonable person who visited the Respondent’s website was likely to be misled in relation to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the products purportedly made available for online sale on the website”); and *Cantor Fitzgerald Securities, Cantor Index Limited v. Cantor Index*, WIPO Case No. [D2010-0807](#) (finding bad faith where “Respondent copied text, logos and other elements from Complainant’s website”).

The Panel 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 <hudabeautycanada.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Douglas M. Isenberg/

Douglas M. Isenberg

Sole Panelist

Date: August 4, 2026