

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Charlotte Tilbury TM Limited v. Ba Tomer J, Thierry Lombard and
no, lar frank
Case No. D2026-3314

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Charlotte Tilbury TM Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Zacco Sweden AB, Sweden.

The Respondents are Ba Tomer J, United States of America ("United States" or "U.S."), Thierry Lombard, United States, and no, lar frank, Philippines.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <charlottetilburry.shop>, <charlottetilburymart.com>, <charlottetilburystore.com>, <charlottetilburyusstore.com> and <charlottetillbury.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 27, 2026. On July 28, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On July 28, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (Privacy User #6e5c030c (et al.), See PrivacyGuardian.org) and contact information in the Complaint.

The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 29, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on July 30, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 7, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 27, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents’ default on August 28, 2026.

The Center appointed Gökhan Gökçe as the sole panelist in this matter on September 4, 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, Charlotte Tilbury TM Limited, together with Islestarr Holdings Ltd., trading as Charlotte Tilbury Beauty, forms part of the Antonio Puig S.A. group, a global business active in the beauty, fashion, fragrance, and skincare sectors. The Puig group was founded in 1914, employs more than 12,100 people worldwide, and sells its products in more than 150 countries.

The Complainant’s group operates a global luxury makeup, skincare, and fragrance business under the CHARLOTTE TILBURY brand and maintains its official website at “www.charlottetilbury.com”. The Charlotte Tilbury business was founded in the United Kingdom in 2013 by makeup artist Charlotte Tilbury.

According to the Complaint, the brand is present in 57 markets and has more than 5,000 points of distribution worldwide, including department stores and travel retail locations. It also has more than 19 million followers on social media and offers beauty technology tools through its mobile application, which has more than 3.4 million users.

The Complainant is the owner of trademark registrations for CHARLOTTE TILBURY in numerous jurisdictions. These include, inter alia:

- European Union Trademark CHARLOTTE TILBURY, Registration No. 004003034, registered on November 4, 2005;
- International Trademark CHARLOTTE TILBURY, Registration No. 1166743, registered on November 7, 2012;
- U.S. Trademark CHARLOTTE TILBURY, Registration No. 3488615, registered on August 19, 2008.

The disputed domain names <charlottetilburymart.com>, <charlottetilburystore.com>, and <charlottetilburyusstore.com>, <charlottetilburry.shop> and <charlottetillbury.com> were registered on December 17, 2025, December 22, 2025, and April 2, 2026, December 22, 2025, and August 14, 2025 respectively.

The disputed domain names <charlottetilburystore.com> and <charlottetilburyusstore.com> resolved to websites displaying the Complainant’s CHARLOTTE TILBURY trademark and logo, as well as images of the Complainant’s products, and purportedly offering CHARLOTTE TILBURY products for sale at discounted prices. The websites also displayed a “© Charlotte Tilbury Store” notice in their footers. The disputed domain name <charlottetilburymart.com> was flagged by its hosting provider as a suspected phishing website and, according to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, redirected Internet users who proceeded past the warning to suspected phishing websites.

The disputed domain name <charlottetilbury.shop> resolved to a website promoting luxury jewelry goods. The disputed domain name <charlottetillbury.com> did not resolve to an active website at the time of filing of the Complaint.

Between January 5, 2026, and July 15, 2026, the Complainant sent trademark infringement notices concerning the disputed domain names. No response was received.

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 are confusingly similar to its trademarks;
- the Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names;
- the Respondents have registered and are using the disputed domain names in bad faith.

B. Respondents

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

6. Discussion and Findings

Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

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.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that three of the five disputed domain names are registered in the name of the same disclosed registrant, "no lar frank". The remaining disputed domain names are registered in the names of different disclosed registrants. The Panel further notes, however, several additional circumstances pointing towards common control of the disputed domain names.

All of the disputed domain names start with the Complainant's CHARLOTTE TILBURY trademark (or a misspelling of this trademark), three of them associate the Complainant's trademark with the related terms "store", "us store" or "mart", were registered through the same Registrar, NameSilo, and have made use of

the same privacy service, PrivacyGuardian. The disputed domain names also engage overlapping technical infrastructure, including Cloudflare and/or DNSOwl name servers. In addition, the registration and contact details disclosed in respect of the disputed domain names contain information which, on the record before the Panel, appears inaccurate, incomplete, or otherwise unreliable. In at least one instance, an email address provided in the registration data generated delivery failures during the proceeding. These circumstances are in addition to the fact that three of the five disputed domain names are held by the same disclosed registrant. The Respondents have not come forward to contest the Complainant's request for consolidation.

The Panel notes that the use of the same Registrar and privacy service, the targeting of the same trademark, and the use of similar technical infrastructure would not, by themselves, be sufficient to establish common control. The Panel also notes that the disputed domain names were registered on different dates and that the corresponding websites are not identical. One of the disputed domain names has been used for a website with content different from the online-store websites associated with some of the other disputed domain names. The Panel has taken these differences into account in assessing the Complainant's consolidation request.

Nevertheless, the applicable test does not require any single factor to be determinative. Rather, the Panel must consider the totality of the circumstances and determine whether the available indicia, taken together, sufficiently point to common control. In the present case, the combination of three disputed domain names being registered to the same disclosed registrant, the common targeting of the same trademark, the similar composition of the disputed domain names, use of the same Registrar and privacy service, overlapping technical infrastructure, and the apparent unreliability or incompleteness of certain registration and contact information, viewed cumulatively and in the absence of any explanation from any of the Respondents suggesting genuine independence, is sufficient for the Panel to find, on the balance of probabilities, that the disputed domain names are subject to common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants (referred to below as "the Respondent") in a single proceeding.

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 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 Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain names are 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, "store", "us store", "mart" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds 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](#), section 1.8.

The disputed domain names <charlottetilburry.shop> and <charlottetillbury.com> contain obvious misspellings of the Complainant's CHARLOTTE TILBURY mark, namely the addition of the letter "r" in "tilbury" and the addition of the letter "t" in "charlotte" and "tilbury", respectively. Such misspellings do not prevent the finding of confusing similarity, as the Complainant's trademark remains clearly recognizable in the disputed domain names. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

Finally, the applicable generic Top-Level Domains ("gTLDs") ".com" and ".shop" are disregarded for the purposes of the confusing similarity assessment, as they are standard registration requirements. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

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 names. 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.

The evidence on record demonstrates that the Complainant's CHARLOTTE TILBURY trademark rights predate the Respondent's registration of the disputed domain names. There is no indication that the Complainant has licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use the CHARLOTTE TILBURY trademark or to register domain names incorporating it. Nor is there any evidence to suggest that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain names.

The disputed domain names <charlottetilburystore.com> and <charlottetilburyusstore.com> resolve to websites which prominently feature the Complainant's CHARLOTTE TILBURY trademark and logo, as well as images of the Complainant's products, and purportedly offer CHARLOTTE TILBURY products for sale. The websites also contain the notice "© Charlotte Tilbury Store" in their footers. The Complainant has not authorized the Respondent to use its CHARLOTTE TILBURY trademark, and the Respondent has no business relationship with the Complainant. In this Panel's view, such use cannot be qualified as a bona fide offering of goods or services in accordance with paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy, since it rather seeks to capitalize on the reputation and goodwill associated with the Complainant's trademark and is likely to mislead Internet users into believing that the websites are operated, authorized, or endorsed by the Complainant.

As regards the disputed domain name <charlottetilburymart.com>, the Complainant's uncontested evidence shows that the corresponding website was flagged by the hosting provider as a suspected phishing website and that Internet users who proceeded past the warning were redirected to suspected phishing websites. Such use cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

As regards the disputed domain name <charlottetilburry.shop>, the evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that it has been used for a website promoting luxury goods unrelated to the Complainant. The Respondent has not provided any explanation or evidence showing that such use is connected with a bona fide offering of goods or services. In the circumstances of this case, and taking into account that the disputed domain name is an obvious misspelling of the Complainant's CHARLOTTE TILBURY trademark, the Panel finds that such use does not give rise to rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

As regards the disputed domain name <charlottetillbury.com>, the record shows that it does not resolve to an active website. There is no evidence that the Respondent has made any bona fide preparations to use the disputed domain name or has otherwise acquired any rights or legitimate interests in it. The Respondent has also provided no explanation for its registration of an obvious misspelling of the Complainant's CHARLOTTE TILBURY trademark. Accordingly, the passive holding of the disputed domain name in these circumstances does not establish rights or legitimate interests for the purposes of the Policy.

In addition, the Respondent did not submit any evidence of bona fide pre-Complaint preparations to use any of the disputed domain names. In particular, the Complainant's uncontested allegations demonstrate that it has not authorized the Respondent to use the CHARLOTTE TILBURY trademark or to register the disputed domain names. Three of the disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's CHARLOTTE TILBURY trademark together with additional terms, while the remaining two disputed domain names consist of obvious misspellings of the Complainant's trademark.

Furthermore, the Panel notes that there is no evidence in the record or Whois information showing that the Respondent might be commonly known by any of the disputed domain names within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

Finally, the Panel notes that there is no evidence in the record showing that the Respondent might be making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain names, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark at issue pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. In particular, the disputed domain names <charlottetilburystore.com> and <charlottetilburyusstore.com> are used for commercial websites purporting to offer CHARLOTTE TILBURY products for sale, while the disputed domain name <charlottetilburymart.com> has been used in connection with suspected phishing activity. Accordingly, none of these uses qualifies as legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

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 must have been aware of the Complainant and its CHARLOTTE TILBURY trademark when registering the disputed domain names. The Complainant's trademark rights significantly predate the registration of the disputed domain names, and the composition and subsequent use of the disputed domain names leave no room for doubt that the Respondent had the Complainant and its trademark in mind at the time of registration.

Furthermore, the Complainant uses the CHARLOTTE TILBURY trademark in connection with its official e-commerce website, through which it offers retail services. Three of the disputed domain names reproduce the Complainant's CHARLOTTE TILBURY trademark, together with terms such as "store", "usstore", and "mart", which are directly associated with online retail activity. Moreover, the disputed domain names namely, <charlottetilburystore.com> and <charlottetilburyusstore.com> resolved to websites prominently displaying the Complainant's trademark and product imagery and presenting themselves as online stores

offering purported CHARLOTTE TILBURY products. The Respondent has not been authorized by the Complainant to use its trademark or to operate any such websites. The Panel considers that such use demonstrates an intentional attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's websites by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites. This constitutes evidence of registration and use in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 3.1.4 and 3.4.

In addition, the disputed domain names <charlottetilbury.shop> and <charlottetillbury.com> consist of obvious misspellings of the Complainant's CHARLOTTE TILBURY trademark. In the Panel's view, the nature of these disputed domain names further supports the finding that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and deliberately targeted its trademark when registering them.

As regards the disputed domain name <charlottetilbury.shop>, the evidence shows that the disputed domain name resolved to a website promoting luxury goods unrelated to the Complainant. In the circumstances of this case, the use of an obvious misspelling of the Complainant's trademark for such a commercial website supports a finding that the disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith.

The suspected-phishing warning placed on the website available at the disputed domain name <charlottetilburymart.com>, in combination with the composition of the disputed domain name, shows that, more likely than not, the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademark.

As regards the disputed domain name <charlottetillbury.com>, Panels have found that the non-use of a domain name would not by itself prevent a finding of bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. To the contrary, in looking at the totality of circumstances in each case, panels have found that the registration and non-use of a domain name can still constitute bad faith for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3. Having reviewed the available record, the Panel notes the distinctiveness and reputation of the Complainant's trademark, and the composition of the disputed domain name, and finds that in the circumstances of this case the passive holding of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel further notes that the Respondent has been an unsuccessful respondent in numerous prior UDRP proceedings involving the registration of domain names incorporating third-party trademarks. See *L'Oréal v. no, lar frank*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-0476](#), *Buck Mason, Inc. v. no, lar frank*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-3635](#), *Valentino S.p.A. v. lar frank, no*, WIPO Case No. [D2026-0169](#), *Huda Beauty Limited v. no lar frank*, WIPO Case No. [D2025-4181](#). This supports the inference that the Respondent is familiar with established brands, including in the beauty and fashion sectors, and deliberately targets third-party trademarks through the registration and use of domain names designed to create an impression of affiliation with the relevant trademark owners. The Respondent's engagement in a pattern of conduct involving the unauthorized use of third-party trademarks and creation of misleading websites strengthens the conclusion that the Respondent registered and is using the disputed domain names in bad faith. This constitutes a pattern of conduct under [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.2.

The Panel also notes the Respondent's failure to respond to the Complainant's trademark infringement notices or to participate in this proceeding, as well as the apparent inconsistencies in the registrant contact information disclosed by the Registrar. While none of these circumstances would necessarily be determinative on their own, they provide further support for the finding of bad faith when considered together with the Respondent's deliberate impersonation of the Complainant and its established pattern of abusive domain name registrations.

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 <charlottetilburry.shop>, <charlottetilburymart.com>, <charlottetilburystore.com>, <charlottetilburyusstore.com>, and <charlottetillbury.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gökhan Gökçe/

Gökhan Gökçe

Sole Panelist

Date: September 19, 2026