

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Byoma Limited v. 陈晓, Austin Conroy, Todd Leonard, Brooklyn Alexander, Brian Thompson, Gene Rishi, tg swff, gtggsw, Damon Prescott, Richard Mitchell, Natalie Bennett, Court light, A Lou Jhnny, Ma Yue, San Domingo
Case No. D2026-2895

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Byoma Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Safenames Ltd, United Kingdom.

The Respondents are 陈晓, China, Austin Conroy, United States of America ("United States" or "US"), Todd Leonard, United States, Brooklyn Alexander, United States, Brian Thompson, United States, Gene Rishi, United States, tg swff, gtggsw, United States, Damon Prescott, United States, Richard Mitchell, United States, Natalie Bennett, United States, Court light, United States, A Lou Jhnny, United States, Ma Yue, United States, and San Domingo, United States.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <buybyoma.shop>, <byama.shop>, <byomaan.shop>, <byomaashop.com>, <byomaashop.online>, <byomaau.shop>, <byomacare.shop>, <byomaca.shop>, <byomadirect.shop>, <byomadiscount.shop>, <byomaen.shop>, <byomae.shop>, <byomalips.shop>, <byoman.shop>, <byomaskincare.shop>, <byomaskin.shop>, <byomastore.shop>, <byomauk.shop>, <byommasell.com>, <byuma.shop>, <getbyoma.shop>, <lovebyoma.shop>, <mybyoma.shop>, <thebyoma.shop>, and <ukbyoma.shop> (the "Domain Names") are registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 2, 2026. On July 2, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Domain Names. On July 3, 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 (Dynadot Privacy Service / Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 6, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to file separate complaints for the Domain Names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that

all Domain Names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 14, 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 the Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 29, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 18, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on August 25, 2026.

The Center appointed Mathias Lilleengen as the sole panelist in this matter on August 31, 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 skincare brand founded in 2020 in Scotland, United Kingdom. The Complainant’s official website can be found at “www.byoma.com”. The domain name of its official website was registered on March 3, 2016. The website receives over 213,000 visits per month from users around the world. The Complainant’s products have been launched in stores and online at beauty retailers such as Sephora, Boots, Urban Outfitters and Space NK. The BYOMA products are also available in the US and Canadian markets, through retailers such as Ulta and Target. The Complainant has generated USD 500 million in sales since its inception. The Complainant is visible through social media platforms, and it has been recognized with awards.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations around the world, such as United States trademark registration number 6690108 for the trademark BYOMA (registered on April 5, 2022).

The Domain Names have been registered between March 26 and June 14, 2026. The Complainant documents that the majority of the Domain Names have at some point resolved to online shops which impersonated the Complainant by using its trademark and logo and purporting to sell the Complainant’s products. The Domain Name <byomae.shop> has resolved to unrelated retail offerings connected to a third-party trademark. At the time of the Decision, the Domain Names resolve to error pages, blocking pages or websites that impersonate the Complainant.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant argues that the Domain Names are under common control of the same person or entity and should be consolidated in the same proceeding. The Domain Names have similar pattern. Twenty-four of the Domain Names include the term “shop”, either as a generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) or within the Second-Level Domain, and only the Domain Name <byommasell.com> includes the term “sell”; both terms are commerce-related. The Domain Names were all registered within a short three-month period with the same Registrar. All of the Domain Names were registered using email addresses comprising names alongside random numbers, despite the registrant’s name differing from the name listed in the email address. Six of the Domain Names have listed identical registrant details based in China. Nineteen of the Domain Names consist of registrant details based in United States with several similarities as to the details in the registrations.

The Complainant documents registered trademark rights for BYOMA and submits that the Domain Names are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. Most of the Domain Names incorporate the BYOMA mark in its entirety, with the addition of either letters, industry specific terms or geographical indicators. The addition of these terms is insufficient to prevent a finding of confusing similarity. On the contrary, the choice of those terms shows the Respondents' intention to create an association with the Complainant's services and therefore reinforces the connection to the Complainant. The remaining three Domain Names <byommasell.com>, <byuma.shop>, and <byama.shop> constitute examples of deliberate misspellings of the Complainant's BYOMA trademark through the addition or omission of a single letter. The alterations made for those three Domain Names are not sufficient to distinguish them from the Complainant's trademark.

The Complainant submits that the Respondents lack rights or legitimate interests in the Domain Names. There is no evidence that the Respondents have any (registered or unregistered) trademark rights to the term BYOMA or any other term used in the Domain Names. Neither have the Respondents received any license from the Complainant to use its trademark. The Respondents have not used, nor prepared to use, the Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. The use of the Domain Names in order to pass off as the Complainant and capitalize on its trademark is not a bona fide offering of goods or services under the Policy. The Complainant submits that the Respondents' current non-use of 16 Domain Names does not constitute a legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

The Complainant argues that the Respondents had the Complainant in mind at the time of registration of the Domain Names as the Complainant has amassed substantial recognition in the skincare and beauty industry. In addition, the Complainant's trademarks predate the Respondents' registration of the Domain Names. The composition of the Domain Names further highlights the Respondents' targeting of the Complainant. The Complainant argues that the Respondents have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, online users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark. It follows from the Respondents' use of the Domain Names. The fact that the Respondents' websites encouraged users to input sensitive data is intrinsically in bad faith. The Complainant points to the Respondents' activation of mail exchange ("MX") records for some of the Domain Names as further indication of bad faith. The current non-use of many of the Domain Names does amend the bad faith as it falls under the doctrine "passive holding". Finally, the Complainant asserts that the Respondents have engaged in a pattern of abusive conduct by registering numerous domain names that encompass the Complainant's trademark.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1. Procedural Issue: Consolidation of Multiple Respondents

The Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant argues that the domain name registrants are the same entity or under common control. The Complainant requests consolidation of the disputes against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules. Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder. In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 4.11.2.

As regards the common control, the Panel notes that the Domain Names appear to target the Complainant in a similar fashion. The Domain Names were registered within a short time span with the same Registrar. The Domain Names have similar pattern of composition. All the Domain Names were registered using email addresses comprising names alongside random numbers, despite the registrant's name differing from the name listed in the email address. Six of the Domain Names have listed identical registrant details based in China. Nineteen of the Domain Names consist of registrant details based in United States with several similarities as to the details in the registrations. The websites associated with the Domain Names registered by the different Respondents also share similarities.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party, in particular as the different domain name registrants have not objected to the Complainant's consolidation request.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

6.2. Substantive Issues

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 the BYOMA trademark. The Complainant's mark is recognizable within the Domain Names. The Domain Names are either misspellings of the Complainant's trademark or they incorporate the Complainant's trademark with different additions as described above by the Complainant. The misspellings do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the Domain Names and the trademark. Neither do the additions. For the purpose of assessing the confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy, the Panel may disregard the Top-Level Domains ("TLDs"). See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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 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 or preparations to use, the Domain Names or names corresponding to the Domain Names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. Moreover, the composition of some of the Domain Names, which consist of the Complainant's mark with a country code, or with a term related to the Complainant's business, carries a risk of affiliation. See [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 majority of the Domain Names for the alleged passing off websites, or the use of a Domain Name in connection with a website offering unrelated products is clear evidence of bad faith under the Policy. The Complainant argues that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, online users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark. The bad faith is underlined by the fact that the Respondent's websites encouraged users to input sensitive data, and the Respondent's activation of MX records. The current non-use of many of the Domain Names does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. The sheer number of Domain Names that encompass the Complainant's trademark points to that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of abusive conduct.

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 <buybyoma.shop>, <byama.shop>, <byomaan.shop>, <byomaashop.com>, <byomaashop.online>, <byomaau.shop>, <byomacare.shop>, <byomaca.shop>, <byomadirect.shop>, <byomadiscount.shop>, <byomaen.shop>, <byomae.shop>, <byomalips.shop>, <byoman.shop>, <byomaskincares.shop>, <byomaskin.shop>, <byomastore.shop>, <byomauk.shop>, <byommasell.com>, <byuma.shop>, <getbyoma.shop>, <lovebyoma.shop>, <mybyoma.shop>, <thebyoma.shop>, and <ukbyoma.shop> transferred to the Complainant.

/Mathias Lilleengen/

Mathias Lilleengen

Sole Panelist

Date: September 14, 2026