

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Kylie Jenner, Inc. v. Vionne Jakubowska

Case No. DAE2025-0011

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Kylie Jenner, Inc., United States of America ("United States"), represented by Studio Barbero S.p.A., Italy.

The Respondent is Vionne Jakubowska, United Arab Emirates ("UAE").

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <kyliecosmetics.ae>, <kyliejennercosmetics.ae>, <kyliejennerskin.ae> and <kylieskin.ae> are registered with AE Domain Administration ("aeDA").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on August 14, 2025. On August 15, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to .aeDA a request for registrant verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On August 19, 2025, .aeDA transmitted by email to the Center its verification response confirming that the Respondent is listed as the registrant and providing the contact details.

The Center verified that the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the UAE Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy for – UAE DRP approved by .aeDA (the "Policy"), the Rules for UAE Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy – UAE DRP (the "Rules"), and the Supplemental Rules for UAE Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy – UAE DRP (the "Supplemental Rules").

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2(a) and 4(a), the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on August 21, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5(a), the due date for Response was September 10, 2025. The Respondent submitted its Response on September 8, 2025. The Complainant sent an email communication to the Center on the same day.

The Center appointed Assen Alexiev as the sole panelist in this matter on September 11, 2025. 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 cosmetics company founded in 2014 by the media celebrity and style icon Kylie Jenner, who was featured in 2018 by Forbes as the youngest-ever self-made billionaire. In 2016, the Complainant launched the KYLIE COSMETICS brand, and in 2019, it introduced a range of KYLIE SKIN skincare products. In 2019, the beauty company Coty Inc. acquired a 51% stake in the Complainant.

The Complainant is the owner of a number of trademark registrations for KYLIE, KYLIE JENNER, KYLIE SKIN, KYLIE COSMETICS or their combinations (jointly, the “KYLIE family of marks”), including the following representative registrations:

- the United States trademark KYLIE with registration No. 5246500, registered on July 18, 2017, for goods in International Class 3;
- the United States trademark KYLIE JENNER with registration No. 5351328, registered on December 5, 2017, for goods in International Class 3;
- the United Arab Emirates trademark KYLIE COSMETICS BY KYLIE JENNER with registration No. 289791, registered on December 16, 2018, for goods in International Class 3; and
- the United Arab Emirates trademark KYLIE SKIN with registration No. 302949, registered on February 3, 2019, for goods in International Class 3; and
- the Brazilian trademark KYLIE COSMETICS with registration No. 914515764, registered on April 9, 2019, for goods in International Class 3.

The Complainant operates its official website at the domain names <kyliecosmetics.com>, registered on September 3, 2015, and <kylieskin.com>, registered on July 2, 2018.

The disputed domain names were registered as follows:

Disputed domain name	Date of registration
<kyliecosmetics.ae>	October 6, 2020
<kyliejennerskin.ae>	October 6, 2020
<kylieskin.ae>	October 8, 2020
<kyliejennercosmetics.ae>	March 27, 2024

According to the evidence submitted by the Complainant, in 2024 the disputed domain names were inactive, and at the time of filing of the Complaint, they resolved to static webpages displaying only the text “KYLIE COSMETICS KYLIE FANS HUB” and a small-print disclaimer of non-affiliation with the Complainant and its trademarks at the bottom of the webpages. The disputed domain names still resolved to the same static webpages on August 21, 2025. The disputed domain names currently resolve to static webpages displaying only the text “BEAUTY FANS HUB” and a disclaimer of non-affiliation with the Complainant and its trademarks. Each of the disputed domain names has mail exchanger (“MX”) settings enabled.

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 names.

The Complainant states that the disputed domain names are confusingly similar to its KYLIE family of marks. It notes that the disputed domain names <kyliecosmetics.ae> and <kylieskin.ae> incorporate the whole of respectively the Complainant's KYLIE COSMETICS and KYLIE SKIN trademarks with the deletion of the space between the two words in the trademarks. The Complainant states that the disputed domain names <kyliejennercosmetics.ae> and <kyliejennerskin.ae> are confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademarks KYLIE, KYLIE JENNER, KYLIE SKIN and KYLIE COSMETICS, and adds that all disputed domain names incorporate the Complainant's KYLIE trademark with the addition of the terms "cosmetics" or "skin", which refer to the Complainant's business.

According to the Complainant, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names, because it has not been authorized to use the Complainant's trademarks or to register and use the disputed domain names. The Complainant adds that the Respondent is not commonly known under the disputed domain names and has no relevant trademark rights.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has not used the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services or carried out any legitimate noncommercial or fair use of them. In this regard, the Complainant notes that the disputed domain names were originally inactive, and after the receipt of the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter, the Respondent activated them to resolve to static webpages displaying the KYLIE trademark and the indication "Kylie Fans Hub" along with a disclaimer of non-affiliation with the Complainant's and its trademarks. According to the Complainant, such use of the disputed domain names is not sufficient to substantiate a legitimate interest in the disputed domain names. The Complainant notes that the websites at the disputed domain names were undeveloped and did not include any further content, while the disclaimer was placed at the bottom of the webpages and in lower characters and did not include accurate information about the Complainant as the trademark owner. According to the Complainant, the Respondent attempted to build a legitimate interest in respect of the disputed domain names and thus a defense to a UDRP complaint by redirecting them to alleged fan sites.

The Complainant contends that the disputed domain names were registered and are being used in bad faith. It submits that its KYLIE and KYLIE COSMETICS trademarks have been recognized as well-known, and the Respondent must have been aware of their existence when it registered the disputed domain names. According to the Complainant, the Respondent acted in opportunistic bad faith by registering the disputed domain names with knowledge of the Complainant's trademarks for the purpose of taking commercial advantage of them.

The Complainant points out that the Respondent set up the disputed domain names to resolve to static webpages publishing the KYLIE COSMETICS trademark and the indication "Kylie Fans Hub" along with a disclaimer of non-affiliation with the Complainant and its trademarks only after it received the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter. According to the Complainant, the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain names, identical and confusingly similar with the Complainant's registered trademarks, to obtain some commercial gain, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's trademarks as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the websites at the disputed domain names. As to the presence of the disclaimer on the webpages at the disputed domain names, the Complainant submits that the Respondent inserted it only after exchanging correspondence with the Complainant, in an attempt to evade the consequences of its infringing registration and use of the disputed domain names.

The Complainant further states that the Respondent registered the disputed domain names to prevent the Complainant from reflecting its trademarks in the disputed domain names and has engaged in a pattern of such conduct, as it registered four domain names incorporating the Complainant's trademarks. The Complainant adds that the configuration of MX records for the disputed domain names also supports a finding of bad faith.

The Complainant states that on October 3, 2024, its representative sent a cease-and-desist letter to the Respondent. On October 10, 2024, the Respondent replied that it had registered the disputed domain names in good faith as an enthusiast and was using them for informational purposes, refusing to comply with the Complainant's request to transfer the disputed domain names. In their further correspondence, the Respondent stated that it was available to transfer the disputed domain names against compensation, and added that it may decide to utilize the disputed domain names in the future for a legitimate business purpose that does not infringe upon the Complainant's trademarks.

B. Respondent

The Respondent states that the disputed domain names are descriptive, as they comprise the common forename "Kylie" combined with dictionary words such as "skin" and "cosmetics", and they point to a fan-information context rather than a source identifier. The Respondent submits that it selected the disputed domain names for their descriptive reference to the subject of fan discussion, not to target the Complainant's trademarks. The Respondent maintains that the websites at the disputed domain names have at all times contained fan-oriented content and displayed prominent disclaimers.

The Respondent states that it intended to operate noncommercial fan hubs providing news, commentary, and user discussions about "Kylie"-branded beauty products. The Respondent points out that the websites at the disputed domain names include prominent disclaimers of non-affiliation, and their branding ("Fans Hub") and disclaimers make the absence of affiliation clear to users. The Respondent maintains that it satisfies the principles of accurate product commentary, conspicuous disclaimers, and no pattern of domain-name acquisition to block the Complainant.

The Respondent states that it has never offered the disputed domain names for sale, rent, or transfer for valuable consideration to the Complainant or to any competitor, and adds that it suggested the possibility of an amicable administrative resolution, which cannot be construed as an offer to sell or rent the disputed domain names. The Respondent states that its conduct is aligned with recognized good-faith settlement practices and cannot be reasonably construed as an intent to sell the disputed domain names for profit or to exploit the Complainant's rights.

According to the Respondent, there is no pattern of conduct preventing the Complainant from reflecting its trademark in a domain name. The Respondent states that it holds a small number of domain names used solely for fan commentary, and adds that it is not a competitor and its websites do not disrupt a competitor's business, as they host fan-oriented commentary.

Respondent submits that it does not monetize traffic, does not run pay-per-click ads and does not promote competing goods. It maintains that the content and prominent disclaimers negate any intent to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion.

6. Discussion and Findings

Paragraph 6(a) of the Policy provides that in order to divest the Respondent of a disputed domain name, the Complainant must demonstrate each of the following:

(i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights; and

- (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 or is being used in bad faith.

Given the similarities between the Policy and Rules and the Uniform Dispute Resolution Policy (“UDRP”), the Panel considers some UDRP precedents as well as the applicable sections of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, (“[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)”), relevant to the present proceeding and will refer to them where appropriate.

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 3.0](#), section 1.7.

In the present case, the Complainant has proven ownership of various registrations for KYLIE, KYLIE JENNER, KYLIE SKIN, KYLIE COSMETICS and other trademarks of the KYLIE family of marks, many of which were registered years before the registration of the disputed domain names.

Disregarding the “.ae” country code Top-Level-Domain (“ccTLD”) as a functional aspect of the domain name system, the disputed domain names all incorporate the Complainant’s KYLIE trademark and other trademarks of the KYLIE family of marks.

The entirety of the Complainant’s KYLIE SKIN trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name <kylieskin.ae>, while the entirety of the Complainant’s KYLIE COSMETICS trademark is reproduced within the disputed domain name <kyliecosmetics.ae>, both without the addition of any other elements. Accordingly, the disputed domain name <kylieskin.ae> is identical to the KYLIE SKIN trademark for the purposes of the Policy, and the disputed domain name <kyliecosmetics.ae> is identical to the KYLIE COSMETICS trademark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The entirety of the KYLIE and KYLIE JENNER trademarks is reproduced within the disputed domain names <kyliejennerskin.ae> and <kyliejennercosmetics.ae>. The trademarks KYLIE SKIN and KYLIE COSMETICS are also easily recognizable in the above disputed domain names. Accordingly, the disputed domain name <kyliejennerskin.ae> is confusingly similar to the KYLIE, KYLIE JENNER and KYLIE SKIN trademarks for the purposes of the Policy, and the disputed domain name <kyliejennercosmetics.ae> is confusingly similar to the KYLIE, KYLIE JENNER and KYLIE COSMETICS trademarks for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

The Panel therefore finds that the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

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 3.0](#), 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 names. The Respondent has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Two of the disputed domain names are identical to trademarks of the KYLIE family of marks, while the other two are combinations of more than one of these trademarks. None of the disputed domain names contain other terms. As discussed in section 2.5.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), UDRP panels have found that domain names identical to a complainant's trademark carry a high risk of implied affiliation. Even 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 Panel considers that the composition of all of the disputed domain names effectively impersonates the Complainant.

The Respondent maintains that the disputed domain names are descriptive, as they comprise the common forename "Kylie" combined with dictionary words such as "skin" and "cosmetics". At the same time, the Respondent submits that it has registered the disputed domain names to operate fan hubs providing news, commentary, and user discussions about KYLIE branded beauty products.

The Panel is not persuaded by the Respondent's arguments, which are mutually exclusive. The four disputed domain names consist of one or more of the KYLIE family of marks without any other elements suggesting that they may be related to fan websites. Considering this, the Respondent's argument that the disputed domain names are descriptive is not convincing.

The Respondent has registered four domain names, and claims that it has registered and used them to operate noncommercial fan hubs providing news, commentary, and user discussions about KYLIE-branded beauty products. However, none of the disputed domain names contains any element suggesting a fan site; the Respondent has not explained why it needs as many as four domain names in the ".ae" ccTLD for the same alleged purpose (and not one), and there is no evidence that the disputed domain names, three of which were registered five years ago, have ever resolved to websites featuring any news, commentary or user discussions about KYLIE branded cosmetics or other fan-oriented content. If the Respondent's real purpose to register the disputed domain names was to use them for a fan-oriented website, it has not explained why it has not done so until now. The evidence submitted by the Complainant shows that all disputed domain names were inactive before the Respondent received the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter in October 2024. For the purposes of assessing fair use under paragraph 6(c)(iii) of the Policy, one of the basic requirements is that the Respondent's fan site must be active. See section 2.7.1 of the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#).

In their correspondence exchanged in 2024 (before the submission of the Complaint), the Respondent did not claim having registered the disputed domain names for a fan-related website. Rather, it stated that they were registered for "informational purposes", that they were relevant to its "business interests" and that its use of them fell "within the doctrine of fair use, which allows for the non-infringing use of trademarks for purposes such as commentary, criticism or parody". The Respondent also proposed three options to the Complainant, which included a transfer of the disputed domain names against compensation, a joint use agreement, or use of the disputed domain names by the Respondent for a "legitimate business purpose". Given the essence of these commercial proposals, and considering that the disputed domain names had not been used by the time when the proposals were made and were activated to point to identical websites with the title "Kylie Cosmetics Kylie Fans Hub" only afterwards, it appears that the Respondent's explanation that the disputed domain names were registered for a fan-related website was formulated for use as a defense under the Policy only later.

Considering all the above, the Panel is not convinced of the Respondent's allegation that it has registered and used the disputed domain names for the purposes of a fan-oriented website. It seems more likely than not that the Respondent has registered them in an attempt to secure a certain commercial advantage for itself vis-à-vis the Complainant, which transpires from the statements made by the Respondent in its pre-Complaint correspondence with the Complainant. Such conduct does not give rise to rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

The Panel therefore finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered or is Being Used in Bad Faith

Each of the four disputed domain names incorporates one or more of the Complainant's KYLIE family of marks without the addition of any other elements, and carries a high risk of implied affiliation with the Complainant. The Respondent has given no explanation why it needed four domain names with such composition in the same ccTLD and for the same purpose, and why it needed to have them all configured with MX records. The evidence on record does not support the Respondent's allegation that it has registered and used them for the purposes of a fan-oriented website, and the fact that three of them were left inactive for four years and were activated only after the Complainant's cease-and-desist letter to show a static webpage rather suggests that the Respondent has made an attempt to construct a defense under the Policy.

In view of the above, the Panel accepts as more likely than not that the Respondent has opportunistically chosen and registered the disputed domain names to take advantage of the reputation of the KYLIE family of marks in order to secure a certain commercial advantage for itself, and has thus registered the disputed domain names in bad faith. The fact that the Respondent has registered not one, but four domain names all identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's KYLIE family of marks and implying an affiliation with the Complainant, also shows that the Respondent has engaged in a pattern of conduct to prevent the Complainant from reflecting its KYLIE family of marks in corresponding domain names, which further supports a finding of bad faith conduct by the Respondent.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 6(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the domain names <kyliecosmetics.ae>, <kylieskin.ae>, <kyliejennercosmetics.ae> and <kyliejennerskin.ae> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Assen Alexiev/

Assen Alexiev

Panelist

Date: September 25, 2025