

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

BEAUTYCOM v. Smith Marc, dftzghu
Case No. D2026-2952

1. The Parties

The Complainant is BEAUTYCOM, France, represented by Ooslo Avocats, France.

The Respondent is Smith Marc, dftzghu, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <blissim-fr.store> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 6, 2026. On July 6, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 7, 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 July 8, 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 to the Complaint on July 11, 2026.

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 of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 10, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Uwa Ohiku as the sole panelist in this matter on August 17, 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 sells cosmetic products through online sales websites, subscription boxes and physical stores, and enjoys a significant reputation in its business. One of its products is an Advent Calendar of cosmetic products which it has been offering for several years during the end-of-year period.

The Complainant holds registrations for the trademark BLISSIM across several jurisdictions, some of which are: International Registration No. 1580666 registered on October 29, 2020, French Registration No. 4684702 registered on September 22, 2020, and French Registration No. 4658874 registered on June 19, 2020. The Complainant has also registered several domain names containing the term “blissim”.

The disputed domain name was registered on April 29, 2026, and according to available record, resolved, at the time of the Complaint, to a website replicating the Complainant's and featuring cosmetic products branded in “BLISSIM”, including Advent Calendars identical to the ones appearing on the Complainant's official website. Presently, it resolves to an inactive page, with the message: “Hmmm....can't reach this page”.

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, asserting particularly as follows:

Identical or Confusingly Similar: that it owns registered and well-established rights in the trademark BLISSIM, which predate the registration of the disputed domain name; that the entirety of the trademark is reproduced and recognizable within the disputed domain name; that the only difference between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark is the addition of the term “fr”, preceded by a hyphen; that the addition of the term “fr” reinforces the impression of an affiliation between the disputed domain name and the Complainant by making an express reference to the territory (France) in which the Complainant has business activities; that the addition of the extension “.store” to the disputed domain name is irrelevant when assessing confusing similarity.

No Rights or Legitimate Interests: that no records show that the Respondent has acquired any trademark or trade name rights corresponding to the disputed domain name; that the Respondent is not affiliated with, authorized or licensed by the Complainant to use its trademark or to register a domain name incorporating it; that the Complainant does not know and has never had a relationship with the Respondent; that the disputed domain name was chosen deliberately and is a malicious attempt to take advantage of the reputation of the Complainant's well-known BLISSIM trademarks; that the Respondent is not making a bona fide offering of goods or services under the disputed domain name, which resolves to a website replicating its official website, and offering for sale, products and services identical to those of the Complainant, including Advent calendars of cosmetic products on which the Complainant's trademark was reproduced; that the Respondent has not come forward to counter or offer any explanation regarding the Complainant's contentions.

Registered and Used in Bad Faith: that the Complainant's rights and reputation in the BLISSIM trademarks predate the disputed domain name and it is inconceivable that the Respondent did not know of the Complainant and its trademark rights at the time of registering the disputed domain name; that at the time it registered the disputed domain name the Respondent had no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name and knew or should have known of the Complainant's trademark rights; that the fact that the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's trademark and includes the term "fr", and the extension ".store" which are directly associated with the Complainant's territory and commercial activities, shows that the Respondent knew of, and had the Complainant's prior rights in mind at the time of registering the disputed domain name; that UDRP Panels have held that the registration of domain names incorporating well-known trademarks by registrants having no plausible explanation for doing so, may in itself, be an indication of bad faith; that at the time of filing the Complaint, the disputed domain name resolved to a website replicating the Complainant's official website and offering for sale, products and services similar to those of the Complainant, including in particular, Advent calendars containing cosmetic products; that the manner of use of the disputed domain name clearly shows that the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to its website through the disputed domain name, for commercial purposes, by creating a manifest risk of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks, which are acts falling within paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy; that taking all the circumstances of this case into consideration, there is no conceivable good faith explanation for the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant supports its contentions with copious evidence comprising several annexes and references to previous UDRP panel decisions and to applicable provisions of the Rules and the Policy, as well as WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), respectively.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 15(a) of the Rules instructs the Panel to "decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted and in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any other rules and principles of laws that it deems applicable". The Respondent's failure to file a Response to the Complaint or to rebut any of the Complainant's contentions does not relieve the Complainant of its responsibility to establish all three elements enumerated in paragraph 4(a) of the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name and the Panel must verify that all three elements are indeed established.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.3.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The first element functions primarily as a standing requirement and involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name.

[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. The entirety of the Complainant's mark BLISSIM is reproduced and recognizable within the disputed domain name and the Panel accordingly finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy.

[WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. The addition of the term "fr", preceded by a hyphen, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8. Further, the extension ".store" is disregarded when assessing confusing similarity.

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:

The complainant in a UDRP proceeding always bears the overall burden of proof. Panels have however 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”, as it requires information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. Thus, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden shifts to the respondent, to produce relevant evidence to demonstrate that it has rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. If the respondent fails to come forward accordingly, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, as applicable to this case: copycat sites, or other types of fraud can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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 had an opportunity to rebut the Complainant’s contentions and prima facie showing but did not come forward with any relevant evidence such as enumerated in the Policy or otherwise, to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in making this assessment as well. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

The Panel has considered the assertions made by the Complainant and the evidence provided in support thereof, including the evidence of the Respondent’s registration and manner of use of the disputed domain name, all of which are unrebutted by the Respondent. The Complainant’s mark BLISSIM has been registered in several jurisdictions around the world well before the disputed domain name was registered; has been used by the Complainant and gained significant reputation in relation to selling cosmetic products through online sales websites, subscription boxes and physical stores, including an Advent Calendar of cosmetic products which it has been offering for several years during the end-of-year period.

The disputed domain name comprises the Complainant’s mark entirely and the addition of the geographical term “fr” (preceded by a hyphen), as well as the extension “.store”, in Panel’s view, further compounds the bad faith element on the part of the Respondent, given the Complainant’s main location (France) and its business activities. Further, the disputed domain name initially resolved to a website replicating the Complainant’s website, products and services, including the Advent calendar of cosmetic products.

Given the widespread registration and use of the Complainant's mark BLISSIM, the manner of use of the disputed domain name, particularly the contents of the website under it, and taking all circumstances of this case into consideration, the Panel concludes on a balance of probabilities, that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its BLISSIM trademark when it registered the disputed domain name and intentionally targeted the Complainant, to attract for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Respondent's website or of products on the Respondent's website.

The disputed domain name presently resolves to an inactive page. However, Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding, but the totality of the circumstances in each case must be looked at to determine if the registration and non-use of a domain name indeed constitutes bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds that in the circumstances of this case, the current passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

Further, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, such as copycat site, as claimed herein, or other types of fraud, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Taking all the foregoing into account, the preponderance of evidence and the circumstances of this case, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy and that the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under 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 <blissim-fr.store> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Uwa Ohiku/

Uwa Ohiku

Sole Panelist

Date: August 24, 2026