

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

The Honest Company, Inc. v. 朱杰 朱杰(jie zhu)
Case No. D2026-2585

1. The Parties

The Complainant is The Honest Company, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Russ August & Kabat, United States.

The Respondent is 朱杰 朱杰 (jie zhu), China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <honestbabyshop.com> is registered with Chengdu West Dimension Digital Technology Co., Ltd. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed in English with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 13, 2026. On June 15, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 16, 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 (Registration Private) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on June 22, 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 amendment in English to the Complaint on June 22, 2026.

On June 22, 2026 the Center informed the Parties in Chinese and English, that the language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. On June 22, 2026, the Complainant confirmed its request that English be the language of the proceeding. The Respondent did not submit any comment on the Complainant's submission.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 in Chinese and English of the Complaint, and the proceeding commenced on June 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 13, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 14, 2026.

The Center appointed Sebastian M.W. Hughes 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 by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

A. Complainant

The Complainant is a company headquartered in the United States and founded in 2012, carrying on business as a retailer of apparel for children and babies, baby care products, and beauty, health, and wellness products, under (amongst other brands) the trade marks HONEST and HONEST BABY CLOTHING (the "Trade Mark(s)"). The Complainant markets and sells its products under the Trade Marks online, via its "www.honest.com" website (the "Complainant's Website"), through its various social media pages and applications, and also at well-known retailers and department stores, and boutique shops.

The Complainant is the owner of registrations in numerous jurisdictions for the HONEST Trade Mark, including United States registration No. 4506748, with a registration date of April 1, 2014.

The Complainant is also the owner of registrations in numerous jurisdictions for the HONEST BABY CLOTHING Trade Mark, including United States registration No. 6309023, with a registration date of March 30, 2021; European Union registration No. 18432693, with a registration date of July 23, 2021; and Chinese registration No. 58560256, with a registration date of December 28, 2022.

B. Respondent

The Respondent is apparently an individual located in China.

C. The Disputed Domain Name

The disputed domain name was registered on October 28, 2023.

D. Use of the Disputed Domain Name

The disputed domain name was previously resolved to an English language website (the "Website") featuring the HONEST BABY CLOTHING Trade Mark; purportedly offering for sale the Complainant's baby clothing products; containing copyright images taken from the Complainant's Website; and displaying the copyright notice "Copyright © 2026 HonestBaby".

As at the date of this Decision, the disputed domain name is no longer resolved to an active 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 that the disputed domain name has been registered and used in bad faith in connection with the Website.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Preliminary Issue: Language of the Proceeding

The language of the Registration Agreement for the disputed domain name is Chinese. Pursuant to the Rules, paragraph 11(a), in the absence of an agreement between the parties, or unless specified otherwise in the registration agreement, the language of the administrative proceeding shall be the language of the registration agreement.

The Complaint was filed in English. The Complainant requested that the language of the proceeding be English for several reasons, including the fact that the Website was entirely in English.

The Respondent did not make any specific submissions with respect to the language of the proceeding.

In exercising its discretion to use a language other than that of the registration agreement, the Panel has to exercise such discretion judicially in the spirit of fairness and justice to both parties, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case, including matters such as the parties' ability to understand and use the proposed language, time and costs (see WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.5.1).

Having considered all the matters above, the Panel determines under paragraph 11(a) of the Rules that the language of the proceeding shall be English.

6.2 Substantive Issues

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#) section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of trade marks or service marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the HONEST Trade Mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds the HONEST BABY CLOTHING Trade Mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

Although the addition of other terms (here, "shop") may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the marks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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.

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 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 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.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

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

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 manner of registration and use of the disputed domain name in respect of the Website, the Panel finds that the requisite element of bad faith has been made out pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Further, panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (here, claimed passing off, or other types of fraud) constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

The Respondent’s subsequent passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent’s registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

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 <honestbabyshop.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Sebastian M.W. Hughes/

Sebastian M.W. Hughes

Sole Panelist

Date: July 27, 2026