

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

LifeStyles Healthcare Pte Ltd v. Theresa W Chavez
Case No. D2026-3189

1. The Parties

The Complainant is LifeStyles Healthcare Pte Ltd, Singapore, represented by Thomsons, Australia.

The Respondent is Theresa W Chavez, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <skyncom.com> is registered with Dynadot Inc (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 21, 2026. On July 21, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 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 (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 22, 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 27, 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 28, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 17, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 19, 2026.

The Center appointed Willem J. H. Leppink as the sole panelist in this matter on August 25, 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 following facts, relevant for deciding on the Complaint, are undisputed.

The Complainant is a sexual health and wellness business with origins dating back to 1905. The Complainant is internationally active in the design, manufacture, marketing, distribution, and sale of condoms, personal lubricants and other sexual health, wellness, and performance products.

The Complainant's SKYN brand was first launched in 2008 in the United States by the Complainant's predecessor in title, when it launched a condom product made with a patent polyisoprene material. It has since become the Complainant's leading brand, and is one of the largest global sexual brands, with it being offered in over 25 countries. The SKYN brand is used in relation to a broad range of sexual health and wellness products, including condoms, personal lubricants, sex toys, and intimate care products. The SKYN products are sold in supermarkets, pharmacies, online third party stores, its own Amazon storefronts, and through its various country based websites.

The Complainant has an extensive global portfolio of wordmarks and combined word / device marks consisting of or including the word SKYN, including the United States trademark (wordmark) SKYN, with registration number 3525372 and a registration date of October 28, 2008, registered for condoms in class 10.

The Complainant is the registrant of various domain names which feature the word SKYN, and operates website at the domain name <skyn.com>.

The disputed domain name was registered on January 5, 2026 and at the time of filing of the Complaint and at the time of rendering this Decision resolves to a website which purportedly advertises SKYN branded condoms with a button named "Explore official store". The copyright notice includes the words "© 2026 SKYN Official at skyncom.com. All Rights Reserved".

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 the following.

The disputed domain name incorporates the entirety of the SKYN trademark, with the "skyn" term being the first and dominant element in the disputed domain name.

The additional element "com" is secondary to, and does not detract from, the dominant "skyn" term in the disputed domain name. Rather, it corresponds to the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD"), ".com", being the most well-known gTLD. Consumers will read the disputed domain name with this in mind, instead of seeing it as a single word. As a result, the SKYN trademark is recognizable in the disputed domain name and the duplication of the element "com" before the gTLD ".com" does not alter this.

A review of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves, shows that the Respondent is offering to sell the Complainant's SKYN branded products. The Complainant has no knowledge of the Respondent and the conduct is not authorized by the Complainant. The website located at the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's product photographs (which amounts to copyright infringement) and uses and reproduces the Complainant's SKYN trademarks and logos (which amounts to both trademark infringement and copyright infringement). The website also includes links to some of the Complainant's social media accounts and its Amazon store, which is clearly an attempt to suggest an affiliation or endorsement of the website by the Complainant (conduct which amounts to passing off).

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name long after the Complainant's predecessor in title made first use of the SKYN trademark and the Complainant has established substantial goodwill and reputation in the SKYN trademark. The Respondent has registered the disputed domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the Complainant's business. Further, since the registration of the disputed domain name, the Respondent has used the disputed domain name in bad faith by attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the disputed domain name, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's SKYN trademark, as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the website located at the disputed domain name.

The Respondent must have visited one of the Complainant's websites in order to obtain the photographs and logos that have been used on the website located at the disputed domain name. Further, the website to which the disputed domain name resolves contains links to the Complainant's Amazon store and some of the Complainant's social media accounts, which makes it plain that the Respondent knew of the Complainant's trademarks.

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 a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is reproduced 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.

Although the addition of other terms, here "com", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such term does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

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.

In addition, UDRP panels have found that even where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term (at the second- or top-level), that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner.

The Panel finds that the website at the disputed domain name suggests that it resolves to an official website of the trademark owner, which on the homepage features the Complainant’s company history and a copyright notice “© 2026 SKYN Official at skyncom.com”. Even if it would be necessary to apply the so-called “Oki Data test”, e.g. if the website would actually be offering the SKYN products, the criterion that the site must accurately and prominently disclose the registrant’s relationship with the trademark holder, is not met. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.8.1.

To the contrary, the Panel finds that the website, also in light of the unrebutted arguments brought forward by the Complainant, can be considered as an attempt to pass off as the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for such illegitimate activity can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

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

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel refers to its considerations under 6.B.

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, at a minimum, clearly was aware of the Complainant and intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark, by creating an “official” web shop passing off as the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for such illegitimate activity 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 <skyncom.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Willem J. H. Leppink/

Willem J. H. Leppink

Sole Panelist

Date: September 1, 2026