

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

AS Beauty Group LLC v. Emma Nelson
Case No. D2026-3832

1. The Parties

The Complainant is AS Beauty Group LLC, United States of America (“United States”), represented by Dorsey & Whitney LLP, United States.

The Respondent is Emma Nelson, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lauragellershop.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 August 26, 2026. On August 27, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 30, 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 August 31, 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 September 2, 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 September 2, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 22, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on September 24, 2026.

The Center appointed Joseph Simone as the sole panelist in this matter on October 1, 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 acquired the LAURA GELLER marks in 2019. The brand was originally founded in 1993 by Laura Geller, a professional makeup artist. In 1997, Ms. Geller launched her makeup line under the LAURA GELLER mark. Today, LAURA GELLER is one of the fast-growing digital beauty and cosmetics brands in the United States, with annual sales revenue exceeding USD 300 million in 2025.

The Complainant has a portfolio of trade mark registrations for the following LAURA GELLER and LAURA GELLER-composite marks, including the following:

- United States trade mark Registration No. 3527188 for LAURA GELLER in class 3, registered on November 4, 2008;
- United States trade mark Registration No. 3103856 for LAURA GELLER MAKEUP and device in class 3, registered on June 13, 2006;
- United States trade mark Registration No. 4787513 for LAURA GELLER and device in class 3, registered on August 4, 2015; and
- United States trade mark Registration No. 4787516 for LAURA GELLER and device in class 3, registered on August 4, 2015.

The Complainant operates a website using the <laurageller.com> domain name.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 6, 2026. The Complainant has submitted evidence showing that the disputed domain name resolved to a website prominently displaying the Complainant's trade mark and stylized logo, purportedly offering the Complainant's products, with the designation "© 2026 – Laura Geller Beauty" in the footer of the website.

At the time of this Decision, the disputed domain name resolves to an error page.

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 registered by the Respondent is confusingly similar to the Complainant's LAURA GELLER mark, and that the addition of descriptive word "shop" does not help to distinguish the source of the goods.

The Complainant asserts that it has not authorized the Respondent to use the LAURA GELLER mark, and there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has used, or has undertaken any demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

The Complainant also claims that there is no evidence that the Respondent has any connection to the LAURA GELLER mark, and that there is no plausible good faith reason for the Respondent to have registered the disputed domain name. The Complainant therefore argues that the registration and any use of the disputed domain name must be in bad faith.

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 trade mark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Panel acknowledges that the Complainant has established rights in the LAURA GELLER trade marks. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

Here, the LAURA GELLER mark is fully incorporated and clearly visible in the disputed domain name. The addition of the term "shop" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the LAURA GELLER mark for purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.8.

The Panel therefore finds that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy in establishing its rights in the LAURA GELLER trade mark and in showing that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its mark.

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.

In this case, the Complainant asserts that it has not authorized the Respondent to use its trade marks and there is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent has used, or undertaken any demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. 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 Respondent did not file a response and has therefore failed to assert factors or put forth evidence to establish that it enjoys rights or other legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent is not affiliated or connected with the Complainant in any manner, and the Complainant has not granted the Respondent any license or authorization to use or register a domain name incorporating the Complainant's LAURA GELLER trade marks. The Respondent did not respond to the Complaint and did not provide any information or factors that could potentially establish rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Complainant claims that the Respondent's intention with the website is to deceive customers under the false belief that they are interacting with the Complainant, or an affiliate of the Complainant, through the Complainant's official website, to which the Respondent has not objected. Given the evidence indicating that the Respondent's website indeed mimicked the Complainant by using the Complainant's name, mark, product images, and website design features, and purportedly offered for sale the Complainant's products, without the Complainant's authorization and absent a disclaimer indicating the lack of relationship between the Parties, the Respondent cannot be considered as having made a bona fide offering of goods or services nor as having engaged in any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, here, claimed impersonation, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The third and final element that a complainant must prove is that the respondent has registered and is using the domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy states that any of the following circumstances, in particular but without limitation, shall be considered as evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith:

- (i) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered or acquired the domain name primarily for the purpose of selling, renting, or otherwise transferring the domain name registration to the complainant (the owner of the trade mark or service mark) or to a competitor of that complainant, for valuable consideration in excess of the respondent's documented out-of-pocket costs directly related to the domain name; or
- (ii) circumstances indicating that the respondent registered the domain name in order to prevent the owner of the trade mark or service mark from reflecting the mark in a corresponding domain name, provided that the respondent has engaged in a pattern of such conduct; or
- (iii) circumstances indicating that the respondent has registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; or
- (iv) circumstances indicating that the respondent is using the domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website or other online location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the respondent's website or location or of a product or service on its website or location.

The examples of bad faith registration and use set forth in paragraph 4(b) of the Policy are not meant to be exhaustive of all circumstances in which bad faith may be found. Other circumstances may also 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.

For reasons discussed under this and the preceding heading, the Panel believes that the Respondent's conduct in this case constitutes bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name. The Respondent registered the disputed domain name incorporating the entirety of the Complainant's LAURA

GELLER mark, a mark that had been in continuous and extensive use for years before the disputed domain name was registered and enjoys a high degree of distinctiveness and recognition in the cosmetics market, with the additional descriptive term “shop” which is associated with the Complainant's online sales. There is no plausible explanation for the Respondent's choice to register the disputed domain name built around the LAURA GELLER mark other than to trade off the Complainant's goodwill and reputation. The Respondent knew, or should have known, of the Complainant's well-established rights in the LAURA GELLER mark at the time of registration. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.2.

Moreover, the Respondent has used the disputed domain name to operate a website featuring the Complainant's branding, logos, color scheme, and images to create an impression of affiliation with or endorsement by the Complainant. This unauthorized conduct falls squarely within the bad faith scenario described in paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. 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 LAURA GELLER mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.1.4.

The disputed domain name currently resolves to an inactive webpage. The Panel finds that the current non-use of the disputed domain name does not prevent a finding of bad faith in the circumstances of this proceeding. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.3.

The Respondent's failure to submit a response to the Complaint further supports the above conclusion, as it leaves unrebutted the Complainant's well-supported contentions and permits the Panel to draw appropriate inferences. See [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 4.3.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(iii) 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 <lauragellershop.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Joseph Simone/

Joseph Simone

Sole Panelist

Date: October 15, 2026