ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

First Hawk Street LLC v. Dillon Young
Case No. D2026-3121

1. The Parties

The Complainant is First Hawk Street LLC, United States of America ("United States"), represented by Sideman & Bancroft, LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Dillon Young, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <cecerds.com> is registered with Dominet (HK) Limited (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 16, 2026. On July 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 17, 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 (Redacted for Privacy) 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 17, 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 Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 23, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 12, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 13, 2026.

The Center appointed Gary Saposnik 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 was launched in February 2024, and through its exclusive licensee, Kirby Beauty LLC d/b/a "Cecred", offers a broad portfolio of hair care products for all hair types and textures. The Complainant's hair care products include shampoos, conditioners, treatment masks, oils, styling products, and related hair care goods. Following its initial direct-to-consumer launch, Cecred made its retail debut with Ulta Beauty in April 2025, marking the largest exclusive hair care launch in Ulta Beauty's history, with the brand's Foundation Collection available in over 1,500 Ulta Beauty stores nationwide and online. Cecred products are also shipped internationally, with the brand's website offering distribution to 55 countries across North America, Europe, the Caribbean, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia.

The Complainant is the owner of numerous trademark registrations worldwide for the trademark CÉCRED, including the following:

- CÉCRED, United States Registration No. 7836661, registered June 17, 2025, in classes 3 and 18;
- CÉCRED, International Registration No. 1717932, registered October 26, 2022, in classes 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 14, 18, 21, 24, and 25.

The Complainant owns and operates the domain name <cecred.com> as its primary website, and it regularly uses "@cecred.com" email addresses in the course of business.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on May 28, 2026. The disputed domain name resolves to a website that substantially duplicates the Complainant's website, including the same branding and product imagery as on the Complainant's website.

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 nearly identical and confusingly similar to the Complainant's CÉCRED trademark in which the Complainant has rights. The disputed domain name consists of a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling of its mark, which constitutes "typosquatting", and is confusingly similar to its CÉCRED mark for purposes of the first UDRP element.

The disputed domain name merely switches the fourth and fifth letters of CÉCRED and adds the letter "s" at the end. These minor alterations do not dispel confusing similarity. Instead, they should be considered a predictable typographical variation of the Complainant's mark and heighten the likelihood that Internet users will mistakenly believe the disputed domain name is associated with, authorized by, or controlled by the Complainant. The transposition and addition of individual letters do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity where the Complainant's mark remains recognizable.

The Complainant avers that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the name "Cécred" or any similar designation. The Complainant has no relationship with the Respondent and has never licensed, authorized, or permitted the Respondent to use the CÉCRED mark or to register the disputed domain name. The Respondent's actual use of the disputed domain name further confirms the absence of rights or legitimate interests. The Respondent has used the disputed domain name in connection with imitation branding and a website that substantially duplicates the Complainant's legitimate website, including the Complainant's copyrighted product imagery. The site appears designed to deceive consumers into believing that it is affiliated with or authorized by the Complainant, and to obtain consumers' personal and financial information. The purported products displayed on the website are also offered at prices disproportionately low compared with market value. Taken together, the evidence suggests that the website does not offer genuine products and instead exists to exploit the Complainant's branding and collect personal and financial information from deceived consumers.

Lastly, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Respondent has used the disputed domain name for fraudulent and deceptive purposes, including impersonating the Complainant to obtain consumers' personal and financial information. Such use of a domain name to facilitate phishing, identity theft, impersonation, or other fraudulent schemes constitutes bad faith registration and use under the Policy.

The website at the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's branding and product imagery to create the false impression that it is an authorized retail outlet offering CÉCRED products at discounted prices. However, when consumers attempt to complete a purchase and enter their personal and financial information, the website returns an error message. This strongly indicates that the site's true purpose is not legitimate commerce, but the collection of consumer data through deception. Such conduct is characteristic of phishing and has repeatedly been found to constitute bad faith. The Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to impersonate the Complainant and deceive consumers is inherently fraudulent and cannot support any legitimate purpose. The evidence further demonstrates that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with full knowledge of the Complainant's CÉCRED mark and specifically to exploit the goodwill associated with that mark. The Respondent's deliberate replication of the Complainant's branding, imagery, and commercial presentation confirms that the disputed domain name was registered and has been used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

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 its CÉCRED trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the CÉCRED mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7. A domain name which consists of a variation of a trademark (typically a common, obvious or intentional misspelling, referred to as typosquatting) is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. The switching of the fourth and fifth letters of CÉCRED and the addition of the letter "s" at the end is considered an intentional misspelling of the Complainant's mark, and the disputed domain name is therefore confusingly similar to the Complainant's mark. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.9.

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 Complainant's evidence reflects its prior rights in the CÉCRED trademark. The Complainant has not granted any license, consent or other right to the Respondent authorizing the Respondent to register the disputed domain name using the CÉCRED trademark. The Respondent does not appear to be commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor is the Respondent making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name. Rather, the Complainant has presented evidence that the disputed domain name resolves to a webpage that displays the CÉCRED mark in connection with promotion and sale of what appears to be the Complainant's CÉCRED products, at significantly discounted prices, while passing itself off as the Complainant. While the disputed domain name is a misspelling of the Complainant's mark, the passing off is further amplified by the content on the disputed domain name's website showing the correct spelling of the CÉCRED mark. The website substantially duplicates the Complainant's website, while also including the Complainant's copyrighted product imagery.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed as applicable to this case: phishing/identity theft, 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, section 2.13.2.

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 Respondent registered the disputed domain name after the Complainant acquired rights in its CÉCRED trademark. The Respondent's contact details do not include an address, other than "Washington D.C.". The Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name, which is a typo domain name clearly based on the Complainant's mark, has been done opportunistically and in bad faith for the benefit or profit of the Respondent. The disputed domain name, on its face, suggests a connection to the Complainant and its services and products, when no such connection exists.

The Respondent used the disputed domain name to resolve to a website purporting to sell beauty products that prominently display the Complainant's stylized mark, as well as copyrighted images of the Complainant's products, at significantly discounted prices. The use on the website clearly shows an intent to target the Complainant's mark, and an intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or of a product or service on the website.

The Complainant has presented evidence of accolades, awards, and recognition for the CÉCRED brand in the beauty industry. Panels have consistently found that the mere registration of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar (particularly domain names comprising typos or incorporating the mark plus a descriptive term) to a well-known trademark, such as the Complainant's mark in the beauty industry, can by itself create a presumption of bad faith. The Respondent's registration of the disputed domain name merely switching of the fourth and fifth letters of CÉCRED and the addition of the letter "s" at the end of the Complainant's mark is a clear attempt at typosquatting. The Panel finds that there is a presumption of bad faith that the Respondent has failed to rebut. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4.

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 assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.1. These circumstances include the nature of the domain name being a typo of a widely known mark. The evidence presented reflects that the Complainant's mark is widely known in the beauty industry and the disputed domain name is clearly a typo of the Complainant's mark. Other factors of bad faith registration are a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no credible explanation for the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name. As previously determined, the Respondent has a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests and has failed to respond to the Complaint with any credible explanation for the choice of the disputed domain name.

Furthermore, a search by the Panel of prior decisions reveals that the Respondent was found to have engaged in a pattern of bad faith conduct with attempted similar schemes of targeting beauty industry-related marks through its use at websites where it passed themselves off as the Complainants. See *John Paul Mitchell Systems v. Dillon Young,* WIPO Case No. D2026-1905; *Victoria Beckham v. Dillon Young,* WIPO Case No. D2026-0623; *Bubble Beauty, Inc. DBA Bubble Skincare v. Dillon Young, Dillon Young,* WIPO Case No. D2026-0036. Additional impersonation decisions against the Respondent include *Leatherman Tool Group, Inc. v. Dillon Young, Dillon Young,* WIPO Case No. D2026-1839 and *Boston Scally Holdings, LLC. v. Dillon Young, Dillon Young,* WIPO Case No. D2026-1319.

Additionally, the Panel finds that the Respondent's contact details are either false and/or incomplete, which is a further indication of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.6.

Lastly, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed as applicable to this case: phishing/identity theft, 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.

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 <cecerds.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gary Saposnik/
Gary Saposnik
Sole Panelist
Date: August 31, 2026