

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Huda Beauty Limited v. Dulles Louis, Louis Dulles
Case No. D2026-3251

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Dulles Louis, Louis Dulles, Germany.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <hudabeautyjapan.com> is registered with CNOBIN Information Technology Limited (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 24, 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 24, 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 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 had launched her beauty blog in 2010. The Complainant offers a range of cosmetics and beauty products under the HUDABEAUTY trademark.

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, the Complainant has developed a substantial international presence. Its products are sold in more than 50 countries and through more than 1,200 retail stores. The HUDABEAUTY brand also has a significant following on social media, including more than 57 million followers on Instagram, 7.7 million followers on Facebook, and more than 4 million subscribers on YouTube.

The record also contains evidence of the presence and recognition of the HUDABEAUTY brand and products in Japan.

The materials submitted by the Complainant include Japanese-language press and beauty-related coverage of HUDABEAUTY, listings of HUDABEAUTY products on Japanese online retail platforms, reviews and discussions of the brand on the Japanese beauty platform @cosme, and other Japanese-language online content concerning HUDABEAUTY products.

The Complainant owns numerous registrations for the HUDABEAUTY trademark in jurisdictions around the world, including 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's portfolio also includes registrations for the HUDABEAUTY trademark in numerous other jurisdictions.

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 <hudabeautyjapan.com> was registered on January 3, 2026. The registration data as confirmed by the Registrar, identifies the Respondent as Dulles Louis, Louis Dulles, Germany.

At the time documented in the evidence, the disputed domain name resolved to a Japanese-language commercial website prominently displaying the HUDABEAUTY trademark and offering for sale numerous cosmetics and beauty products presented as HUDABEAUTY products.

The products were displayed with prices denominated in Japanese yen.

The evidence further shows that the website reproduced product images corresponding to images used 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 "japan".

The Complainant submits that the addition of this term does not prevent a 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 Japanese-language commercial website prominently displaying the HUDABEAUTY trademark and offering purported HUDABEAUTY products for sale. The website displays prices in Japanese yen and reproduces product images appearing on the Complainant's official website.

The Complainant asserts that the website is presented in a manner intended to give Internet users the impression that it is an official or authorized Japanese 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 and Japanese-language presentation 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 commercial 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 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

Paragraph 4(a) of the Policy requires the Complainant to establish each of the following three elements:

- (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 has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established rights in the HUDABEAUTY trademark by virtue of its trademark registrations.

The disputed domain name incorporates the HUDABEAUTY trademark in its entirety, followed by the geographical term “japan”.

The Complainant’s trademark is therefore clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name.

As set out in section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ([“WIPO Overview 3.1”](#)), 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 under the first element. Accordingly, the addition of the geographical term “japan” does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Complainant’s HUDABEAUTY trademark.

The generic Top-Level Domain (“gTLD”) “.com” is viewed as a standard registration requirement and is therefore disregarded under the confusing similarity test. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights.

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 the 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 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 also no evidence in the record that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name resolves to a Japanese-language commercial website prominently displaying the HUDABEAUTY trademark and offering for sale products presented as HUDABEAUTY products. The website reproduces product images corresponding to those used on the Complainant's official website and does not disclose any relationship, or lack thereof, between the Respondent and the Complainant. In the Panel's view, such use is not consistent with a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Moreover, the composition of the disputed domain name, consisting of the Complainant's HUDABEAUTY trademark in its entirety followed by the geographical term "japan", carries a risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. Moreover, the fact that the associated website is directed at Japanese consumers and offers products under the Complainant's trademark, 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 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.

The Panel notes that the Complainant's rights in the HUDABEAUTY trademark substantially predate the registration of the disputed domain name. In view of the distinctive nature of the HUDABEAUTY trademark, the incorporation of the trademark in its entirety in the disputed domain name together with the geographical term "japan", and the use made of the disputed domain name, the Panel finds that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its trademark when registering the disputed domain name.

This conclusion is reinforced by the content of the website to which the disputed domain name resolves. The website is presented in Japanese, prominently displays the HUDABEAUTY trademark, offers for sale products presented as HUDABEAUTY products with prices denominated in Japanese yen, and reproduces product images corresponding to those appearing on the Complainant's official website. These circumstances demonstrate that the Respondent specifically targeted the Complainant and its HUDABEAUTY trademark.

The Panel further finds that the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name falls within the circumstances described in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. By using the disputed domain name to operate a commercial website offering products under the HUDABEAUTY trademark, the Respondent has intentionally attempted 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 website or of the products offered on it.

The addition of the geographical term "japan" does not dispel such confusion. Rather, in the circumstances of this case, where the associated website is presented in Japanese and displays prices in Japanese yen, it may reinforce the impression that the disputed domain name leads to an official or authorized Japanese website of the Complainant.

The Respondent has not submitted a Response and has therefore provided no explanation for its registration and use of the disputed domain name capable of rebutting the circumstances described above. The Panel finds, on the balance of probability, that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that 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 <hudabeautyjapan.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Erica Aoki/

Erica Aoki

Sole Panelist

Date: September 9, 2026