

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Huda Beauty Limited v. Sylvia Gallacher, Sylvia Gallacher
Case No. D2026-3248

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Sylvia Gallacher, Sylvia Gallacher, Germany.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <hudabeautyaustralia.com> is registered with Mat Bao Corporation (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 23, 2026. On July 23, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 28, 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, Domain Admin) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 29, 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 31, 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 August 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 23, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Erica Aoki as the sole panelist in this matter on August 26, 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 company active in the beauty and cosmetics industry. The HUDABEAUTY brand was founded in 2013 by beauty blogger Huda Kattan, who launched her beauty blog in 2010.

The Complainant offers a range of cosmetics and beauty products under the HUDABEAUTY trademark. Its products are sold internationally, including in Australia, where HUDABEAUTY products have been available through Sephora Australia since 2016.

The Complainant has established a substantial international presence. According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, its products are sold in more than 50 countries and in more than 1,200 retail stores, and the HUDABEAUTY brand has a significant following on social media, including more than 57 million followers on Instagram, 7.7 million followers on Facebook, and 4.17 million subscribers on YouTube.

The Complainant owns numerous registrations for the HUDABEAUTY trademark in jurisdictions around the world, including Australian Trademark Registration No. 1806380, registered on November 1, 2016; European Union Trade Mark Registration No. 015755549, registered on December 19, 2016; United Kingdom Trademark Registration No. UK00003200733, registered on March 3, 2017; and United States of America Trademark Registration No. 5459220, registered on May 1, 2018.

The Complainant registered the domain name <hudabeauty.com> on April 3, 2010, which it uses in connection with its official website.

The disputed domain name was registered on December 20, 2025. It resolves to a website prominently displaying the HUDABEAUTY trademark and offering cosmetics and beauty products presented as HUDABEAUTY products.

The website also displays KAYALI-branded perfume products and reproduces product images appearing on the Complainant's official website.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its HUDABEAUTY trademark. The disputed domain name incorporates the HUDABEAUTY trademark in its entirety, with the addition of the geographical term "australia".

The Complainant submits that the addition of this term does not prevent the finding of confusing similarity, as the HUDABEAUTY trademark remains clearly recognizable in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant further contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted to use the HUDABEAUTY trademark or to register any domain name incorporating it.

The Complainant also asserts that there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or has acquired any trademark rights corresponding to it.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent is not using the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or for any legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

The disputed domain name resolves to a commercial website prominently displaying the HUDABEAUTY trademark and offering purported HUDABEAUTY products for sale.

The Complainant asserts that the website reproduces product images from its official website and is presented in a manner intended to give Internet users the impression that it is an official or authorized website of the Complainant, although no such relationship exists.

The Complainant further submits that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

The Complainant's trademark registrations substantially predate the registration of the disputed domain name, and the composition of the disputed domain name, together with the content of the associated website, demonstrates that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its HUDABEAUTY trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

The Complainant contends that, by using the disputed domain name for a website displaying the HUDABEAUTY trademark and offering purported HUDABEAUTY products, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users to the website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the products offered on it.

The Complainant also notes that a separate UDRP complaint has been filed concerning the domain name <hudabeautyjapan.com>, whose disclosed registrant uses the same email address as the Respondent in the present proceeding.

The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to it.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that:

- (i) the disputed domain name is 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 disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name was registered and is 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 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 Panel finds that the Complainant has demonstrated rights in the HUDABEAUTY trademark through its registered trademark rights.

The disputed domain name incorporates the Complainant's HUDABEAUTY trademark in its entirety, followed by the geographical term "australia".

The Complainant's trademark remains clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

Panels have consistently held that, where the relevant trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, the addition of other terms, whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise, does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity for purposes of the first element ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8).

The generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" is a standard registration requirement and is typically disregarded for purposes of assessing confusing similarity under the first element of the Policy ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1).

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's HUDABEAUTY trademark.

The first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings rests with the complainant, panels have recognized that proving that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests may involve the difficult task of proving a negative, as relevant information 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 disputed 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 that the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its HUDABEAUTY trademark or to register a domain name incorporating the trademark. There is no evidence in the record that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name or has acquired any trademark or service mark rights corresponding to it.

The disputed domain name resolves to a commercial website prominently displaying the Complainant's HUDABEAUTY trademark and offering purported HUDABEAUTY products for sale. The website also reproduces product images appearing on the Complainant's official website. Such use does not support the finding of a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use within the meaning of paragraph 4(c) of the Policy.

Moreover, the disputed domain name combines the Complainant's HUDABEAUTY trademark in its entirety with the geographical term "australia". Given that the Complainant markets and sells its products in Australia, the composition of the disputed domain name carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1). Moreover, the content of the associated website, including the prominent use of the HUDABEAUTY trademark and the reproduction of the Complainant's product imagery, increases the risk of Internet user confusion.

The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

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 non-exhaustive list of circumstances that may constitute evidence of registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

The Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with knowledge of the Complainant and its HUDABEAUTY trademark.

The Complainant's trademark rights substantially predate the registration of the disputed domain name. Moreover, the disputed domain name incorporates the HUDABEAUTY trademark in its entirety together with the geographical term "australia", a country in which the Complainant markets and sells its products.

The content of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves further demonstrates that the Respondent specifically targeted the Complainant when registering the disputed domain name.

The website prominently displays the HUDABEAUTY trademark, offers products presented as HUDABEAUTY products for sale, and reproduces product images appearing on the Complainant's official website. In these circumstances, the Panel finds that the Respondent's choice of the disputed domain name cannot reasonably be considered coincidental.

The nature of the disputed domain name and the content of the associated website support the finding of bad faith registration ([WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1).

As to use in bad faith, paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy provides that bad faith may be found where, by using a domain name, a respondent has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location 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 a product or service offered on it.

The Panel finds that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name falls within this circumstance. The disputed domain name itself suggests an Australian website associated with the Complainant, while the website reinforces that impression through the prominent display of the HUDABEAUTY trademark and the reproduction of product imagery from the Complainant's official website.

The website is commercial in nature and offers beauty products for sale. On the record before it, the Panel finds that the Respondent has intentionally sought to attract Internet users to the website for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's HUDABEAUTY trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website and the products offered thereon.

Such conduct constitutes bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy (see [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4).

The Panel further notes that the registrant of the domain name <hudabeautyjapan.com>, which is the subject of a separate UDRP proceeding brought by the Complainant, appears to use the same email address as the Respondent in the present proceeding.

The Complainant expressly brought this circumstance to the Center's attention in its amended Complaint.

While the Panel does not need to rely on this circumstance to reach its conclusion, it provides additional support for the inference that the Respondent deliberately targeted the Complainant and its HUDABEAUTY trademark.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. 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 that the disputed domain name <hudabeautyaustralia.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Erica Aoki/

Erica Aoki

Sole Panelist

Date: September 9, 2026.