

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Rationale Skincare Pty Ltd v. Joyner Joyner

Case No. D2026-3858

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Rationale Skincare Pty Ltd, Australia, represented by Herbert Smith Freehills Kramer Australia, Australia.

The Respondent is Joyner Joyner, United States of America ("United States").

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <rationalepro.com> is registered with TuringSign Inc. d/b/a Cosmotown (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 28, 2026. On August 28, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On August 29, 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 ("Registrant details privacy protected and pending retrieval by relevant UDRP provider") 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 4, 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 8, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was September 28, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 1, 2026.

The Center appointed Gareth Dickson as the sole panelist in this matter on October 8, 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 an Australian company that operates a skincare business. The Complainant states that it has used the trade mark RATIONALE in connection with that business since 1992, and that RATIONALE branded products are sold in physical retail locations in Australia, the United Kingdom, Singapore, New Zealand and North America, and through its website at <rationale.com>.

The Complainant is the owner of registrations for the trade mark RATIONALE (the “Mark”) in class 3 in a number of jurisdictions, including the following:

- Canadian trade mark registration number TMA957,796, registered on December 13, 2016;
- New Zealand trade mark registration number 847626, registered on August 15, 2011; and
- United States trade mark registration number 4177638, registered on July 24, 2012.

(The Complainant also provided a certificate of the registration of the Mark in Australia under number 1096773, but this certificate states that that registration was due for renewal on February 1, 2026 and no evidence of such renewal has been provided. Accordingly, the Panel has disregarded this particular registration for the purposes of resolving this Complaint, but notes that it would have made no difference to the outcome.)

The disputed domain name was registered on December 4, 2025.

The website at the disputed domain name displays products for sale bearing the Mark and seemingly using images of the Complainant’s products that were extracted from the Complainant’s website and other promotional material, and an “About Us” page that substantially reproduces the Complainant’s own history.

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 wholly incorporates the Mark and that the addition of the term “pro” does not distinguish the disputed domain name from the Mark but is likely to strengthen an association with the Complainant’s brand. The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name because the Respondent has not made a bona fide offering of goods or services, has not identified itself on the website by reference to an individual, business entity or company registration, and has published an “About Us” page that substantially reproduces the Complainant’s history with the intention, the Complainant alleges, of creating a false impression of a connection to the Complainant. The Complainant states that its Internet searches for the Respondent’s name “Joyner Joyner” did not locate any business or commercial activity in that name, and that it has not granted the Respondent permission to use the Mark or to offer its goods for sale under the Mark or use its marketing materials.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, in that the Respondent is attempting to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source of the

products offered. The Complainant asserts that the disputed domain name was registered after its trade mark rights accrued, that the Mark has acquired a reputation (including through its “Essential Six” product range, which it states has been offered since at least 2013, and through publications in third party media), and that the word “rationale” has no descriptive meaning in relation to skincare products. The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no reason to use the Mark, whether alone or as part of the disputed domain name, other than to trade on the Complainant’s reputation. The Complainant requests that the disputed domain name be transferred to the Complainant.

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, “pro”) 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 recognised 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. Furthermore, while it is true that the Mark is capable of bearing a dictionary meaning in certain circumstances, its use by the Respondent to advertise for sale products bearing the Mark, while using

the Complainant's marketing materials, in both instances without the Complainant's permission, puts it beyond doubt that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

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 registered the disputed domain name on December 4, 2025, long after the Complainant had first used and registered the Mark, and that the disputed domain name incorporates the Mark in its entirety with the addition of the term "pro". The website at the disputed domain name displays products for sale using images of the Complainant's products and an "About Us" page that substantially reproduces the Complainant's own history, all without the authorization of the Complainant. The Respondent has not responded to these assertions.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity, such as the impersonation of the Complainant and the misappropriation and misuse of the Complainant's proprietary marketing materials, constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name with the Complainant and the Mark in mind, and that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to intentionally attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website or of the products on it, which is evidence of registration and use in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute 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 <rationalepro.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Gareth Dickson/

Gareth Dickson

Sole Panelist

Date: October 23, 2026