

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Huda Beauty Limited v. Lucas Brown
Case No. D2026-3026

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Huda Beauty Limited, British Virgin Islands, United Kingdom, represented by Rouse Consultancy (Shanghai) Ltd., China.

The Respondent is Lucas Brown, Hong Kong, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <hudabeautyme.com>, and <hudabeautymena.com> are registered with NameSilo, LLC (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 9, 2026. On July 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 9, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center the verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Unknown) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 17, 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 amended Complaint on July 22, 2026.¹

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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 13, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 16, 2026.

¹The Complainant removed one domain name from the Complaint upon receipt of the Center’s notice regarding multiple underlying registrants.

The Center appointed Zoltán Takács as the sole panelist in this matter on August 21, 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 beauty, makeup & skincare company and brand, founded in 2013 by beauty blogger Huda Kattan.

Huda Kattan was listed among others as “The 25 Most Influential People on the Internet” by the Time magazine in 2017, “The Top Beauty Influencers and The Top Creators” by Forbes magazine in 2017 and 2022 and “The America’s Richest Self-Made Women” by Forbes magazine in 2023.

The Complainant is the owner of among others the European Union Trademark Registration (“EUTM”) No. 015755549 for the mark HUDABEAUTY registered on December 19, 2016, and the International Trademark Registration (“IR”) No. 1842704 for a figurative mark registered on November 12, 2024, consisting of a stylized HUDA textual element.

The disputed domain names were registered on May 13 and May 16, 2026. The evidence provided by the Complainant shows that the disputed domain name <hudabeautymena.com> previously redirected to a website hosted at the disputed domain name <hudabeautyme.com> which website featured the same pink color as that used on the Complainant’s official website “www.hudabeauty.com”, as well as the Complainant’s signature figurative mark and purportedly offered for sale clothing goods. Subsequently, both of the disputed domain names redirected to a website at “www.hudabeauty-me.com”, which reproduced the same content previously displayed at the disputed domain name <hudabeautyme.com>.

At the time of the Decision the disputed domain names resolve to inactive webpages.

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 names.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

- the disputed domain names which incorporate the entirety of its HUDABEAUTY trademark with the addition of the terms “mena” and “me” is confusingly similar to the trademark;
- the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names since it is unable to rely on any of the circumstances set out in paragraphs 4(c)(i), (ii), or (iii) of the Policy; and
- given the reputation of the Complainant’s trademark which the disputed domain names fully incorporate and their use as mentioned above, it is impossible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its trademark and registered the disputed domain names for any other reason than to unduly benefit from the prestige of the Complainant and its trademark without authorization.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain names be transferred from the Respondent to the Complainant.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

6.1 Procedural Matter - Multiple Domain Names

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to two disputed domain names registered by the same domain name registrant.

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. Due to the fact that the disputed domain names have been registered by the Respondent the Panel finds that this requirement is fulfilled.

6.2 Substantive Matters – Three Elements

A complainant must evidence each of the three elements required by paragraph 4(a) of the Policy in order to succeed on the complaint, namely that:

- (i) the domain names are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights;
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain names; and
- (iii) the domain names have been registered and are being used in bad faith.

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 names. 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.

The entirety of the Complainant's HUDABEAUTY trademark is reproduced and recognizable in the disputed domain names.

Although the addition of other terms, here "me" and "mena" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds that the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain names and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.7 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 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 names.

The Panel notes that the Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or allowed the Respondent to use its trademark in the disputed domain names or in any other way.

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 names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

As mentioned above, the disputed domain names which fully incorporate the Complainant’s HUDABEAUTY trademark used to resolve to a website that purportedly offered for sale clothing articles with the website featuring the same pink color as that used on the Complainant’s official website “www.hudabeauty.com” as well as the Complainant’s signature figurative mark. In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent’s conduct points towards targeting of the Complainant, and, as such, the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain names does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services nor a legitimate or fair use and cannot confer any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names on the Respondent.

The Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names and that 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.

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

In the present case, the Panel notes that the disputed domain names fully contain the Complainant’s trademark that was registered and used long before the Respondent acquired the disputed domain names.

Also, as mentioned above, the Respondent used the disputed domain names to resolve to a website purportedly offering for sale clothing goods yet prominently featuring the same pink color as that used on the Complainant’s official website “www.hudabeauty.com” as well as the Complainant’s signature figurative mark.

The Respondent defaulted and thus failed to provide any explanation for its inclusion of the Complainant’s trademark in the disputed domain names. In absence of any such explanation and based on the above facts and circumstances, the Panel infers on balance that the Respondent knew of the Complainant and its trademark and registered the disputed domain names to target the Complainant. Therefore, the Panel finds that the disputed domain names were registered and used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Currently, there is no evidence that the disputed domain names are being used in any active way. However, from the inception of the UDRP, panelists have found that the non-use of a domain name (including a blank or “coming soon” page) would not prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

In view of the Panel, in the totality of the circumstances, being the reputation of the Complainant’s trademark in the fashion industry, the composition of the disputed domain names as mentioned above, the Respondent’s lack of any rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names, and the Respondent’s failure to submit a response and the prior use of the disputed domain names, the current non-use of the disputed domain names does not prevent a finding of bad faith.

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 names <hudabeautyme.com> and <hudabeautymena.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Zoltán Takács/

Zoltán Takács

Sole Panelist

Date: September 4, 2026