

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Hairitage IP LLC v. Kai Conner

Case No. D2026-2662

### **1. The Parties**

Complainant is Hairitage IP LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Dorf Nelson & Zauderer LLP, United States.

Respondent is Kai Conner, United States.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <gethairitagebymindy.shop> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on June 18, 2026. On June 19, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On June 22, 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 (Dynadot Privacy Service, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to Complainant on June 24, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. Complainant filed an amended Complaint on June 25, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 26, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was July 16, 2026. Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified Respondent’s default on July 22, 2026.

The Center appointed Lorelei Ritchie as the sole panelist in this matter on July 24, 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**

Complainant, together with its predecessors and affiliates (collectively “Complainant”) is a company based in the United States. Since approximately December 2019, Complainant has offered hair-care and related products under the mark HAIRITAGE. Complainant owns registrations for its HAIRITAGE mark. These include, among others, United States Registration Nos. 6,035,620 (registered April 14, 2020) and 7,135,393 (registered August 15, 2023).

The disputed domain name was registered on May 22, 2026. Respondent has used the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that mimics Complainant’s website, including prominent display of Complainant’s marks and used Complainant’s product images without any disclaimer of affiliation.

#### **5. Parties’ Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

Complainant contends that (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to Complainant’s trademarks; (ii) Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name; and (iii) Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith.

Complainant contends that it owns rights to the HAIRITAGE mark. Complainant contends that the disputed domain name incorporates-in-full Complainant’s distinctive HAIRITAGE mark, along with reference to Complainant’s founder, “world famous influencer and hair stylist Mindy McKnight.” Complainant asserts that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interest in the disputed domain name. Complainant alleges that Respondent has set up a website at the disputed domain name impersonating Complainant, and including “illegitimate and unauthorized uses” of Complainant’s marks with references to Complainant’s founder, who has been featured with her HAIRITAGE products in media such as Women’s Wear Daily as well as in a case study for Harvard Business School. In this regard, Complainant alleges that Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain name in bad faith, with knowledge of Complainant’s prior rights, presumably for Respondent’s own commercial gain.

##### **B. Respondent**

Respondent did not reply to 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 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. Complainant has shown rights in respect of the HAIRITAGE mark, which is recognizable within the disputed domain name without regard to the addition of the terms “get,” “by,” and “mindy.” The disputed domain name is confusingly similar to Complainant’s HAIRITAGE mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.2.1 and 1.8.

The Panel finds that 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 complainant, panels have recognized that proving 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 respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on complainant). If respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that Complainant has established a prima facie case that Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. Respondent has not rebutted 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. Respondent has no affiliation with Complainant, and no authorization to use Complainant’s marks.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity such as passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds that the second element of the Policy has been established.

### **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

There are several ways that a complainant can demonstrate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith. As noted in section 4 of this Panel’s decision, the record includes evidence that Respondent has used the disputed domain name to resolve to a website that mimics Complainant’s own website. This includes prominent display of Complainant’s marks, with no disclaimer of affiliation. The Panel thus finds sufficient evidence that Respondent was aware of Complainant’s rights and Complainant’s marks at the time of registering the disputed domain name, and has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. See also *Hairitage IP LLC v. Andrew Tetan*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3231](#).

The Panel finds 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 that the disputed domain name <gethairitagebymindy.shop> be transferred to Complainant.

/Lorelei Ritchie/

**Lorelei Ritchie**

Sole Panelist

Date: August 5, 2026