

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Ricardo Jose Jaar Abudinen v. colentivoalierct's projects  
Case No. DCO2026-0021

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Ricardo Jose Jaar Abudinen, Colombia, represented by Cavalier Abogados, Colombia.

The Respondent is colentivoalierct's projects, Colombia.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <belahbeauty.co> is registered with Name.com, Inc. (the "Registrar").

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on March 4, 2026. On March 5, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On March 5, 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 (Name.com, Inc) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on March 6, 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 amendment to the Complaint March 6, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the 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 March 10, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was March 30, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on April 8, 2026.

The Center appointed Francisco Castillo-Chacón as the sole panelist in this matter on April 13, 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, Ricardo Jose Jaar Abudinen, is an individual residing in Bogotá, Colombia, and the owner of the BELAH BEAUTY trademark in Colombia. The Complainant operates the BELAH BEAUTY brand in the cosmetics sector, offering a line of skincare and beauty products through an e-commerce platform targeting Colombian consumers.

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademark registrations issued by the Superintendencia de Industria y Comercio (SIC) of Colombia:

(i) Word mark “BELAH BEAUTY”, Registration Certificate No. 804533, Class 3 of the Nice Classification (non-medicinal soaps, perfumery products, essential oils, non-medicinal cosmetics and related beauty products), File No. SD2024/0117081, registered on January 20, 2026, valid to January 20, 2036; and

(ii) Mixed mark “belah BEAUTY”, Registration Certificate No. 738881, Classes 3 and 35 of the Nice Classification (non-medicinal cosmetics and related products in Class 3; advertising, business management, and business administration related to the sale of cosmetics in Class 35), File No. SD2022/0108754, registered on August 9, 2023, valid to August 9, 2033.

The Complainant operates an e-commerce website at <belahbeauty.com> (registered September 23, 2022), through which it commercially offers BELAH BEAUTY branded cosmetic products to consumers in Colombia.

The disputed domain name <belahbeauty.co> was registered on February 10, 2026. The website at the disputed domain name <belahbeauty.co> is a faithful visual replica of the Complainant’s legitimate e-commerce website at the domain name <belahbeauty.com>, reproducing its overall design, layout, product photographs, product names, promotional language, and pricing in Colombian pesos. The website displayed and offered the same branded cosmetic products, including the Metallic Longwear Cream Eyeshadow, Effortless Dewy Cream Blush, Ultra Shine Volumizing Lip Gloss, and others, at prices identical to those on the Complainant’s legitimate platform, and prompted consumers to enter personal and financial information to complete purchases.

The Respondent did not submit any Response to the Complaint and is accordingly in default.

#### **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 submits that the disputed domain name <belahbeauty.co> is confusingly similar to its BELAH BEAUTY trademark. The disputed domain name incorporates the mark in its entirety, merely omitting the space between the two words — an omission technically inevitable in domain names and wholly irrelevant from a trademark standpoint. The ccTLD “.co” — the country code Top-Level Domain for Colombia — does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity and, if anything, reinforces the association with the Complainant’s Colombian operations. The Complainant further notes that the disputed domain name differs from its own legitimate domain name <belahbeauty.com> only in the ccTLD, making the similarity near-identical and highly likely to cause confusion among Colombian consumers.

The Complainant submits that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has never been authorized to use the BELAH BEAUTY mark. The Respondent has not used the disputed domain name in connection with any bona fide offering of goods or services; rather, it has configured the website at the disputed domain name <belahbeauty.co> as a deliberate visual copy of the Complainant's legitimate e-commerce platform, with the apparent purpose of deceiving consumers and capturing their personal and financial data. This conduct — constituting phishing and/or passing off — can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#)<sup>1</sup>, section 2.13.1.

The Complainant argues that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy. The Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's BELAH BEAUTY mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the website. The Respondent went beyond merely registering a confusingly similar domain name by actively replicating the Complainant's website to maximize the deceptive effect on consumers, constituting phishing and passing off. The Complainant relies on the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), which recognizes that the use of a domain name for such illegal activity is manifestly evidence of bad faith.

## **B. Respondent**

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

## **6. Discussion and Findings**

Under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the Complainant must establish each of the following elements:

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

The Panel is satisfied that the Center has taken all steps required under the Rules to give the Respondent proper notice of the Complaint and a fair opportunity to respond. The Respondent did not submit any Response and has accordingly failed to rebut the Complainant's assertions or to advance any basis upon which it might claim rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name.

The Panel accordingly proceeds to consider whether the Complainant has established the three elements required under paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

### **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.

---

<sup>1</sup> The WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)") was superseded by WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)").

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 Complainant has demonstrated rights in the BELAH BEAUTY mark through two trademark registrations issued by the Colombian Superintendencia de Industria y Comercio: word mark Certificate No. 804533 (Class 3, valid to January 20, 2036) and mixed mark Certificate No. 738881 (Classes 3 and 35, valid to August 9, 2033). The Panel finds that the Complainant has established trademark rights in the BELAH BEAUTY mark for the purposes of the Policy.

The disputed domain name <belahbeauty.co> reproduces the BELAH BEAUTY mark in its entirety. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7. The omission of the space between “BELAH” and “BEAUTY” is technically inevitable in domain names and is wholly irrelevant to the confusing similarity analysis. The ccTLD “.co” is disregarded as it constitutes a standard registration requirement. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1. The disputed domain name is accordingly confusingly similar — and for all practical purposes nearly identical — to the Complainant’s BELAH BEAUTY mark.

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.

The evidence on record establishes that the website at the disputed domain name <belahbeauty.co> is a deliberate and near-exact visual replica of the Complainant’s legitimate e-commerce website at <belahbeauty.com>. The Respondent has reproduced the Complainant’s branding, product photography, product names, promotional language (including “BELAH’S SMOOTHIES” and “WEAR THE GLOW, FEEL THE CARE”), and pricing in Colombian pesos, creating a website designed to mislead Colombian consumers into believing they are transacting with the genuine BELAH BEAUTY brand. This conduct — constituting copycat sites, passing off — can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Respondent has not come forward with any evidence to rebut the Complainant’s prima facie showing. The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

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.

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 copycat sites, 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.

First, the Complainant had established trademark rights in the BELAH BEAUTY mark in Colombia before the disputed domain name was registered. Both parties are located in Colombia, and the BELAH BEAUTY brand has been commercially active through the domain name <belahbeauty.com> since September 2022. It is inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's mark and commercial operations at the time of registration.

Second, and most significantly, the Respondent has not merely registered a confusingly similar domain name. The Respondent actively configured the website at the disputed domain name "belahbeauty.co" as a faithful visual copy of the Complainant's legitimate e-commerce platform at the domain name "belahbeauty.com", reproducing its design, product imagery, promotional language, and pricing. The evident purpose is to deceive Colombian consumers into believing they are interacting with the genuine BELAH BEAUTY brand, thereby capturing their financial data or diverting their purchases from the Complainant (passing off). This conduct falls squarely within paragraph 4(b) of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

WIPO panels have consistently held that the use of a domain name for copycat sites or passing off constitutes evidence of bad faith registration and use. The Respondent's wholesale replication of the Complainant's website satisfies this standard in full.

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 <belahbeauty.co> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Francisco Castillo-Chacón/*

**Francisco Castillo-Chacón**

Sole Panelist

Date: April 21, 2026