ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
L'Oréal v. CeraVe ZAIN ULLAH
Case No. D2026-4143

1. The Parties

The Complainant is L'Oréal, France, represented by Dreyfus & associés, France.

The Respondent is CeraVe ZAIN ULLAH, Pakistan.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <cerave-pakistan.com> (the "Disputed Domain Name") is registered with GoDaddy.com, LLC (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 14, 2026. On September 16, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the Disputed Domain Name. On September 16, 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 (Registration Private) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 17, 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 17, 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 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was October 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on October 9, 2026.

The Center appointed Rosita Li 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

The Complainant is a French industrial group specializing in the field of cosmetics and beauty. It was founded in 1909 and acquired various skincare brands, including CeraVe. Its line of skincare products under the brand name "CeraVe" can be found in over 40 countries, including in Pakistan.

The Complainant is the owner of trademark registrations and applications for CeraVe in various jurisdictions for skincare products, including:

1. European Union Trade Mark No. 016162752 for CERAVE, registered in Class 3 on June 21, 2017; and
2. United States Trade Mark No. 3234519 for CERAVE, registered in Class 3 on April 24, 2007;

(collectively, the "CERAVE Trademarks").

The Complainant is also the owner of a domain name that comprises the CERAVE Trademarks, namely <cerave.fr>, registered on July 19, 2017.

The Disputed Domain Name was registered on September 11, 2025.

The Complainant reported the Disputed Domain Name to the former Registrar, HOSTINGER operations, UAB on June 11, 2026, and requested that the Disputed Domain Name, which was directed to an online store (the "Respondent's Website") displaying the Complainant's CERAVE name, official logo, and purportedly offering CERAVE products for sale, be blocked. On June 12, 2026, the former Registrar blocked the Disputed Domain Name.

The Disputed Domain Name was subsequently re-registered through the current Registrar, GoDaddy.com, LLC. The Respondent's Website was reactivated on August 10, 2026, and continues to be accessible at the time of preparing this decision.

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.

(i) The Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights. The Complainant contends that:

- The Complainant is the owner of the CERAVE Trademarks.
- The Disputed Domain Name incorporates the CERAVE Trademarks in their entirety, followed by a hyphen and the geographical term "pakistan". This combination may mislead Internet users into believing that the Disputed Domain Name is legitimate or endorsed by the Complainant for the Pakistani market.
- The inclusion of a hyphen is insufficient to distinguish the Disputed Domain Name from the CERAVE Trademarks.
- The extension ".com" is not to be taken into consideration when examining the identity or confusing similarity between the CERAVE Trademarks and the Disputed Domain Name.

(ii) The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name. The Complainant contends that:

- The Complainant has not authorized, licensed, or permitted the Respondent to register or use the Disputed Domain Name, or to operate a website reproducing the CERAVE Trademarks, official logo, product reference, and brand identity.
- There is no affiliation between the Complainant and the Respondent.
- The Complainant has not found any evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name or the name "CERAVE".
- Registrations for the CERAVE Trademarks predate the registration of the Disputed Domain Name by several years.
- The Respondent's Website creates a clear false affiliation with the Complainant by displaying the CERAVE Trademarks, allegedly offering CERAVE products, and carrying the inaccurate copyright notice "© 2026 CeraVe Pakistan. All rights reserved".
- Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services or a legitimate noncommercial or fair use, instead it seeks to misleadingly divert Internet users for commercial gain.

(iii) The Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant contends that:

- It is implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant when it registered the Disputed Domain Name, considering (1) the Complainant is well-known throughout the world; (2) the composition of the Disputed Domain Name; and (3) the fact that registrations for the CERAVE Trademarks predate the registration of the Disputed Domain Name.
- A simple trademark or online search would have demonstrated CERAVE Trademarks and products.
- The Respondent concealed its identity and contact information when registering the Disputed Domain Name.
- The fact that the Respondent re-registered the Disputed Domain Name through another Registrar to reactivate the Respondent's Website indicates the Respondent's intent to continue the abusive use of the Disputed Domain Name.
- The Complainant considers that many Internet users attempting to visit the Complainant's website have ended up on the Respondent's Website. The Complainant never authorized the Respondent to use or display the CERAVE Trademarks, official logo, or the alleged CERAVE products. The inaccurate copyright notice strengthens the false impression of affiliation.
- It is more likely than not that the Respondent registered and used the Disputed Domain Name in bad faith, with the primary intention of capitalizing on the CERAVE Trademarks and creating initial interest confusion.

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 CERAVE Trademarks and the Disputed Domain Name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("WIPO Overview 3.1"), section 1.7.

Based on the available materials, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purpose of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds that the entirety of the CERAVE Trademarks is reproduced within the Disputed Domain Name. The addition of a geographical term "pakistan" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under this first element. Accordingly, the Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the CERAVE Trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, sections 1.7 and 1.8.

Based on the available materials, 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 the 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.

In accordance with WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.5.1, where a domain name consists of a trademark plus an additional term (at the second- or top-level), UDRP panels have largely held that such composition cannot constitute fair use if it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the trademark owner. The Disputed Domain Name has included the CERAVE Trademarks in their entirety, which would easily be understood as referring to the Complainant's products, and be interpreted by Internet users as indicating some form of relationship or association with the Complainant. The Panel notes that the geographical term of "pakistan" in the Disputed Domain Name increases the risk of false affiliation, as the Complainant is present in the Pakistan market.

For purposes of assessing fair use under UDRP paragraph 4(c)(i), before any notice of the dispute, a respondent must use or show demonstrable preparations to use the domain name or a name corresponding to the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services. In the present case, the Respondent's Website is an online store displaying the CERAVE Trademarks and official logo and offering purported CERAVE products for sale without the Complainant's authorization. The Panel notes the Respondent's name includes the term "CeraVe", however the Panel believes this term has been used to create confusion, and that there is no other indication that the Respondent has been commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name.

Given the above, the Panel finds that there is a high risk that the public would assume that the Disputed Domain Name is authorized by or affiliated with the Complainant. It is clear that the use of the Disputed Domain Name, which incorporates the CERAVE Trademarks in their entirety, is an attempt by the Respondent to capitalize on the goodwill and reputation of the CERAVE Trademarks. The Panel does not consider such use to be a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the Disputed Domain Name nor a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Based on the available materials, 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 Disputed Domain Name incorporates the CERAVE Trademarks in their entirety. The Panel also notes that the Disputed Domain Name was registered on September 11, 2025, well after the registration of the CERAVE Trademarks. The Panel notes that the Complainant has spent substantial time, effort, money and resources in acquiring, using and maintaining its CERAVE Trademarks and domain name. As such, the Complainant's business conducted under the CERAVE Trademarks represents a high volume of goodwill, representation and financial value. The Panel is therefore satisfied that the CERAVE Trademarks are well-known and reputable, with long standing and substantial use by the Complainant in the field of skincare products. The Panel is prepared to find that the Respondent knew or should have known that the registration of the Disputed Domain Name would be confusingly similar to the CERAVE Trademarks. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.2.2. Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent's registration of the Disputed Domain Name, which is confusingly similar to the CERAVE Trademarks, is a clear indication of bad faith. The Panel considers that the Respondent's Website's content and the re-registration of the Disputed Domain Name through another Registrar add to this finding.

In accordance with paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy, the circumstances indicate that the Respondent, by registering and using the Disputed Domain Name, has intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to the Respondent's Website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the CERAVE Trademarks, in particular, in relation to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, endorsement of the Respondent's Website and of the products featured on the Respondent's Website.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that 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 <cerave-pakistan.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Rosita Li/
Rosita Li
Sole Panelist
Date: October 28, 2026