ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Tangle Teezer Ltd v. Arjan Kaan, soopltryler.com
Case No. D2026-3949

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Tangle Teezer Ltd, United Kingdom, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Arjan Kaan, soopltryler.com, Netherlands (Kingdom of the).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <tangleteezer.space> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 3, 2026. On September 3, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 3, 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, Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 7, 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 9, 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 11, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 1, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 7, 2026.

The Center appointed Mario Soerensen Garcia as the sole panelist in this matter on October 14, 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

Founded in 2007, the Complainant is a British company related to the manufacturing of hair care products,.

The Complainant owns the following trademark registrations:

Trademark	Trademark number and registration date	Classes
TANGLE TEEZER	International Reg. No. 953741, registered on January 25, 2008	3, 21, and 25
TANGLE TEEZER	International Reg. No. 1262393, registered on November 4, 2014	3, 8, 11, 21, 26, 35, and 44
TANGLE TEEZER	United Kingdom Reg. No. UK00904345963, registered on April 26, 2006	3, 21, and 25

The Complainant also owns the domain name <tangleteezer.com>, registered on January 19, 2005, which resolves to its official website.

The Respondent is Arjan Kaan, soopltryler.com, from the Netherlands (Kingdom of the).

The disputed domain name was registered on April 15, 2026, and resolves to an inactive 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.

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name is identical to the trademark TANGLE TEEZER.

The Complainant submits that there is no evidence that the Respondent has made demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name for legitimate purposes, nor is there any evidence that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name in connection with any noncommercial or fair use. The Complainant argues that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

According to the Complainant, the presence of mail exchange ("MX") records for the disputed domain name strongly implies that it could be used as part of a phishing or impersonation scheme in the future. The Complainant further submits that, because the disputed domain name is identical to its trademark, it carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant.

According to the Complainant, it has prior rights over the trademark TANGLE TEEZER and has not authorized the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name. Therefore, the Complainant's intellectual property rights for TANGLE TEEZER trademarks predate the registration of the disputed domain name. The Complainant argues that the registration and use of the disputed domain name have been conducted in bad faith under the doctrine of passive holding. In addition, the Complainant asserts

that the Respondent currently holds registrations for several other domain names that misappropriate the trademarks of well-known brands and businesses. This demonstrates that the Respondent is engaging in a pattern of cybersquatting/typosquatting, which is evidence of bad faith. The Complainant also sent a cease and desist letter to the Respondent on June 8, 2026, and the Respondent did not reply to it.

The Complainant requests the transfer of the disputed domain name.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

In accordance with paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must prove that each of the following three elements is satisfied:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the 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

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 mark TANGLE TEEZER is reproduced in its entirety within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is identical to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

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 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 the Respondent to register or use its TANGLE TEEZER trademark. There is no evidence on record indicating that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name. Nor does the record demonstrate any use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the disputed domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, or any legitimate noncommercial or fair use. The Respondent has not replied to the Complainant's contentions or provided any evidence rebutting this prima facie case.

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 finds that the Respondent was likely aware of the Complainant's trademarks as the disputed domain name incorporates the TANGLE TEEZER trademark in its entirety. Besides, the Complainant's trademark registrations and domain name predate the registration date of the disputed domain name by years.

Although the disputed domain name does not resolve to an active website, panels have found that the non-use of a domain name, including a blank page, 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, the composition of the disputed domain name, and the lack of the Response, 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 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 <tangleteezer.space> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mario Soerensen Garcia/
Mario Soerensen Garcia
Sole Panelist
Date: October 28, 2026