ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

# ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
Huda Beauty Limited v. Tammy Stilwell
Case No. D2026-4038

## 1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Tammy Stilwell, Germany.

## 2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <hudabeautyireland.com> is registered with Mat Bao Corporation (the "Registrar").

## 3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 9, 2026. On September 9, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 14, 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 (Domain Admin, The RDAP server redacted the value) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 15, 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 16, 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 25, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 15, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 16, 2026.

The Center appointed Haig Oghigian as the sole panelist in this matter on October 23, 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 British Virgin Islands company specialized in cosmetics and other beauty products. Beginning as a blog in 2010, the Complainant first released products in 2011 and now sells over 100 products in more than 50 countries, including Ireland, the United Arab Emirates, Germany and the United States of America ("United States"). In connection with its business, the Complainant is the owner of a significant number of trademark registrations that consist of or comprise HUDABEAUTY.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations for HUDABEAUTY, such as but not limited to:

| Trademark | Jurisdiction | Registration Number | Registration Date |
|---|---|---|---|
| HUDABEAUTY | European Union | 015755549 | December 19, 2016 |
| HUDABEAUTY | United States | 5459220 | May 1, 2018 |
| HUDABEAUTY | United Arab Emirates | 261946 | April 18, 2017 |

The Complainant operates its website at "www.hudabeauty.com" and others.

The disputed domain name was registered by the Respondent on December 20, 2025. It resolves to a website displaying the Complainant's mark and purportedly offering for sale the HUDABEAUTY-branded products

## 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 is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights.

The Complainant owns trademark registrations for HUDABEAUTY, which predate the registration of the disputed domain name by the Respondent by several years at minimum. The Complaint states that the relevant trademark, HUDABEAUTY is contained within the disputed domain name, though with the terms "ireland" added. The Complainant submits that the HUDABEAUTY trademark is fully reproduced in the disputed domain name and as "ireland" is a geographic term.

-The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant argues that as they have demonstrated rights to the mark contained within the disputed domain name, and have never licensed mark to the Respondent meaning that the Respondent cannot have used the mark with permission. The Complainant adds that the Respondent has no presence using the mark or similar marks, nor has the Respondent demonstrated any ownership of any marks that bear similarity with marks owned by the Complainant, and that the use of the disputed domain name to sell potentially counterfeit goods with the Complainant's marks and branding further demonstrates that the Respondent does not have a legitimate intent for use of the disputed domain name.

-The disputed domain name was registered and used in bad faith.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain name was registered well after the Complainant's marks related to HUDABEAUTY were filed and registered. The Complainant further states that the disputed domain name reproduces the Complainant's mark, while having no relationship to that mark even though the Respondent should have been aware of the Complainant due to their established brand, industry recognition and numerous trademark registrations, and therefore constitutes bad faith registration. The Complainant also demonstrated that the disputed domain name resolved to a website which had unauthorized uses of the Complainant's mark, and was being used to sell potentially counterfeit goods, arguing this constitutes a clear demonstration of bath faith use and registration.

**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, "ireland" may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such a 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 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 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate or illegal activities here, claimed sale of potentially counterfeit goods, and passing off, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.13.1.

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 acted in bad faith as it reproduced, without authorization, the Complainant's mark. The Panel further notes the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name to purportedly sell HUDABEAUTY-branded goods using the Complainant's mark without authorization can only constitute both bad faith registration and use of the disputed domain name. This points to both knowledge of the Complainant and their marks, and an attempt to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its web site or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its web site or location or of a product on its web site or location. Paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Rules. .

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, but other circumstances may 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.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate and illegal activity here, claimed sale of potentially counterfeit goods, and passing off, constitutes bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitutes 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 <hudabeautyireland.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Haig Oghigian/*
**Haig Oghigian**
Sole Panelist
Date: November 6, 2026