

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Mason Pearson Bros. Limited v. CHEN JIE

Case No. D2026-2621

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Mason Pearson Bros. Limited, United Kingdom ("UK"), represented by Reddie & Grose LLP, UK.

The Respondent is CHEN JIE, China.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <masonpearsons.com> is registered with PDR Ltd. d/b/a PublicDomainRegistry.com (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on June 16, 2026. On June 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 18, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that 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 of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 29, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 19, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on July 20, 2026.

The Center appointed Angelica Lodigiani as the sole panelist in this matter on July 27, 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 is a UK-based company, founded in 1850 and named after its founder. The Complainant designs and manufactures high-end hairbrushes, grooming tools, and haircare products sold under the trademark MASON PEARSON.

The Complainant is the owner of various registrations consisting of, or including the wording MASON PEARSON, in numerous jurisdictions worldwide, including the following:

- MASON PEARSON (word), UK registration No. 00002340175, filed on August 8, 2003, and registered on January 16, 2004, for goods in classes 3, 18, 21, and 25;
- MASON PEARSON (word), International registration No. 818167, registered on January 23, 2004, for goods in classes 3, 18, 21, and 25, designating various jurisdictions, including China;
- MASON PEARSON LONDON. ENGLAND. (figurative), International registration No. 1246871, registered on March 2, 2015, for goods in classes 3, 18, 21 and 25, designating various jurisdictions, including China.

The Complainant is also the owner of the domain name <masonpearson.com>, registered on October 7, 1997, which it uses in connection with its official website.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 7, 2026, allegedly by an individual located in China. The disputed domain name resolves to a website featuring the Complainant's figurative MASON PEARSON LONDON. ENGLAND. mark and purportedly offering for sale products identical to those for which the Complainant is known and with which it is associated.

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 is confusingly similar to its MASON PEARSON mark, as it incorporates the mark in its entirety with the sole addition of the letter "s" at the end. The Complainant's mark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant did not authorize the Respondent to use the disputed domain name, nor is the Complainant affiliated with or otherwise connected to the Respondent. The Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name but is instead seeking to confuse and mislead consumers and to free ride on the reputation and goodwill associated with the Complainant's MASON PEARSON mark. Indeed, the disputed domain name resolves to an unauthorized online retail store offering MASON PEARSON-branded products, including hairbrushes and related haircare products. The Respondent's website contains numerous references to goods offered for sale under the Complainant's mark, prominently displays the Complainant's mark, and reproduces images that appear on the Complainant's website. Therefore, the Complainant presents itself as connected with, or endorsed by, the Complainant.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant's MASON PEARSON mark enjoys reputation, and the Respondent has no plausible justification for registering a domain name that wholly incorporates that mark. Moreover, the website associated with the disputed domain name closely mirrors the Complainant's official website,

offering for sale the Complainant's products, or purported versions thereof, and reproducing identical imagery and language. Accordingly, the website associated with the disputed domain name is highly misleading and damages the reputation and goodwill associated with the Complainant's MASON PEARSON mark, and interferes with the Complainant's ability to market its products.

In conclusion, the Complainant maintains that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the Complainant's business and has used the disputed domain name to intentionally attempt to attract Internet users to the Respondent's website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

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 trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The 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. In particular, the Complainant has shown that it owns registered rights over the trademark MASON PEARSON.

The disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's mark, with the sole addition of a letter "s" at the end. A domain name which consists of a variation of a trademark (typically a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling) is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element of the Policy. This stems from the fact that the domain name contains sufficiently recognizable aspects of the relevant mark. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

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 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.

The Respondent has no relationship with the Complainant, and the Complainant has never authorized the Respondent to use its MASON PEARSON mark in any manner, including as part of the disputed domain name. Moreover, nothing in the record indicates that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name has not been used in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or in connection with a legitimate noncommercial or fair use. Rather, it resolves to a website featuring the Complainant's figurative mark and promotional materials and purporting to offer for sale the Complainant's branded products at highly discounted prices. The Respondent's website displays, at the bottom of the home page, a United States of America ("United States") address, an email address incorporating the disputed domain name, and a "© 2026 Mason Pearson" copyright notice. The disputed domain name and the overall appearance of the website are highly misleading for Internet users, as Internet users may not notice the subtle misspelling of the Complainant's trademark in the dispute domain name, and the website closely imitates the Complainant's official website. The website further contains information regarding payment methods and sections entitled "Our Store", "Customer Care" and "Support" including an "About Us" link leading to information unrelated to the Complainant. There is no disclaimer on the website, indicating the absence of an affiliation between the Respondent and the Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity here, claimed copycat sites, 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.

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 the Complainant's mark corresponds to the name and surname of the Complainant's founder and is therefore uniquely associated with the Complainant. The disputed domain name is a typosquatted version of the Complainant's mark and is used in connection with a website displaying the Complainant's figurative mark, promotional materials and photographs of the Complainant's products.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name being aware of the Complainant's mark and with the intention of targeting the Complainant and its business.

The registration of a domain name, confusingly similar to a third party's distinctive mark, being aware of such mark and in the absence of rights or legitimate interests amounts to registration in bad faith.

As far as use in bad faith is concerned, as explained above, the disputed domain name resolves to a misleading website purportedly offering the Complainant's products for sale at heavily discounted prices. Through the disputed domain name and the associated website, the Respondent is impersonating the Complainant and misleading Internet users into believing that the website is operated, sponsored, or endorsed by the Complainant, when in fact it is operated by an unaffiliated third party. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to

intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity such as copycat sites, passing off, or other types of fraud constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes bad faith under the Policy.

In light of the foregoing, 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 <masonpearsons.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Angelica Lodigiani/

Angelica Lodigiani

Sole Panelist

Date: August 10, 2026