ARBITRATION
AND
MEDIATION CENTER

WIPO
WORLD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION
L'Oréal v. Shima Yasemi
Case No. DIR2026-0008

1. The Parties

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

The Respondent is Shima Yasemi, Iran (Islamic Republic of).

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <lancombeauty.ir> is registered with IRNIC.

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on September 8, 2026. On September 8, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to IRNIC a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On September 12, 2026, IRNIC 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 (Not disclosed) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on September 14, 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 and the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the .ir Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Policy" or "irDRP"), the Rules for .ir Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for .ir Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (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 September 18, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5(a), the due date for Response was October 8, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. On October 12, 2026, the Center notified the Respondent's default.

The Center appointed Mireille Buydens as the sole panelist in this matter on October 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 is a leading French industrial group specialized in the field of cosmetics and beauty, created in 1909 and active worldwide. The Complainant employs 86,000 employees, and is present in 150 countries.

The Complainant notably owns the LANCÔME Trademark (hereafter "the LANCÔME Trademark" or "the Trademark"), which has been used for decades as a brand for luxury beauty products and enjoys a worldwide reputation.

The Complainant owns numerous registrations for the LANCÔME Trademark around the world, including notably:

- International trademark registration No. 157412 for LANCÔME (word mark), registered on November 12, 1951, and designating inter alia Iran (Islamic Republic of).

The Complainant also owns and operates the domain name <lancome.com> registered on July 8, 1997, resolving to its official website.

The disputed domain name was registered on July 20, 2025. The Complainant has provided evidence that the disputed domain name resolves to an e-commerce site in Persian, offering for sale beauty products from various companies, including alleged LANCÔME-branded products and the Complainant's competitors' products. In the "About Us" section[1], it is stated (in Persian, machine translation) "Lancôme Beauty (..) specializes in providing specialty cosmetics and hair care products. All Lancôme Beauty products are authentic and come from the brand's country of origin".

Upon the detection of the disputed domain name, the Complainant sent on August 18, 2026 a notification to the hosting provider requesting the deactivation of the website under the disputed domain name but based on the available record, no action was taken despite several reminders.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

First, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the LANCÔME Trademark, which enjoys a worldwide reputation, as it constitutes a misspelling of the Complainant's well-known LANCÔME Trademark: the usual Latin character form "lancome" is reproduced with the sole omission of the final letter "e" and the addition of the descriptive term "beauty". The omission of the letter "e" in the Trademark LANCÔME is characteristic of typosquatting and does not prevent the LANCÔME Trademark from remaining clearly recognizable within the disputed domain name. The addition of the country code Top-Level Domain ("ccTLD") ".ir" in the disputed domain name is typically to be disregarded for the purposes of assessing confusing similarity.

[1] Although the Complainant did not submit evidence capturing the "About Us" section of the website at the disputed domain name, the Panel, exercising its discretion and general powers under paragraphs 10 and 12 of the Rules, has visited the website and verified the relevant content.

Second, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is neither affiliated with the Complainant in any way nor has it been authorized by the Complainant to use and register its LANCÔME Trademark, or to seek registration of any domain name incorporating said Trademark. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name or the name "lancôme". The disputed domain name is so confusingly similar to the Complainant's well-known LANCÔME Trademark and the Complainant's official domain name that the Respondent cannot reasonably pretend it was intending to develop a legitimate activity through the disputed domain name. Rather, the Respondent is using the disputed domain name for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers seeking the Complainant and its products. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent's website omits any information about the company operating the website under the disputed domain name. Finally, given the Complainant's goodwill and renown worldwide, the typosquatting nature of the disputed domain name, and its use in connection with a commercial beauty-products website, the Complainant asserts that it is not possible to conceive a plausible circumstance in which the Respondent could legitimately use the disputed domain name without creating a misleading association with the Complainant and taking unfair advantage of the Complainant's rights in the LANCÔME Trademark.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent registered and uses the disputed domain name in bad faith. Concerning the registration in bad faith, the Complainant asserts that it is implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant and its well-known LANCÔME Trademark when it registered the disputed domain name. The composition of the disputed domain name confirms that the Respondent was aware of the Complainant and its LANCÔME Trademark as the disputed domain name is a deliberate typographical variation of "lancome", created by omitting only the final letter "e", while the added term "beauty" directly refers to the sector in which the Complainant and the LANCÔME brand operate. Further, a simple search online via a search engine using the keyword "lancôme" would have revealed the existence of the Complainant's LANCÔME Trademark.

Concerning the use in bad faith, the Complainant submits that the Respondent is using the disputed domain name to intentionally attract Internet users to its website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's LANCÔME Trademark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or endorsement of the products offered on the Respondent's website. The website prominently operates under the name "Lancom Beauty", and uses the term "lancom" as the dominant element of the website's commercial identity for selling beauty products. Internet users are likely to believe that the website under the disputed domain name is operated, authorized, sponsored or otherwise commercially connected with the Complainant, or that it constitutes an authorized Iranian retailer or distributor of LANCÔME products.

B. Respondent

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

6. Discussion and Findings

According to the irDRP, in order to succeed in a transfer or cancellation of a domain name, the complainant must prove that each of these three elements is present:

1. The disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights;
2. The respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
3. The disputed domain name has been registered or 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[2].

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the LANCÔME Trademark is recognizable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the LANCÔME Trademark for the purposes of the Policy. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.7.

The only difference between the LANCÔME Trademark and the disputed domain name is the deletion of the final letter "e" and the addition of the term "beauty". Although the addition of other terms, here "beauty", may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such 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.

Further, the ccTLD ".ir" is a standard registration requirement and is typically disregarded in the confusing similarity test. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 1.11.1.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4 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.

According to the Complaint, which has not been rebutted by the Respondent, the Respondent is not licensed by, nor affiliated with, the Complainant in any way. The Respondent is not an authorized dealer, distributor, reseller or service provider of the Complainant. There is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name, nor is there any evidence of use or demonstrable preparations to use the disputed domain name for a bona fide offering of goods or services. There is no evidence of legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the disputed domain name, either.

On the contrary, the Panel notes that the disputed domain name reproduces the well-known LANCÔME Trademark with the mere deletion of the final letter "e" and the addition of the descriptive term "beauty" which directly refers to the sector in which the Complainant and the LANCÔME Trademark operate. As a result,

[2] Given the similarities between the Policy and the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy ("UDRP"), the Panel deems the WIPO Overview 3.1 and the prior UDRP decisions relevant.

the disputed domain name in itself carries a risk of implied affiliation, which cannot constitute fair use as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. The Panel finds that the composition of the disputed domain name signals the Respondent's intention of taking unfair advantage of the likelihood of confusion between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's well-known LANCÔME Trademark as to the origin or affiliation of the website.

The Panel further notes that, even if the Respondent were found to be a distributor or reseller of the Complainant's products, the circumstances would not support a finding of rights or legitimate interests under the *Oki Data* test, particularly given that the website at the disputed domain name also offers products of the Complainant's competitors. See WIPO Overview 3.1, section 2.8.2 and *Oki Data Americas, Inc. v. ASD, Inc.*, WIPO Case No. D2001-0903.

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

C. Registered or Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4 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.

According to the irDRP, in order to succeed in a transfer or cancellation of a domain name, the Complainant must prove that the disputed domain name has been registered or is being used in bad faith. It is not necessary to prove both the registration and the use in bad faith.

Concerning the registration in bad faith, the Panel notes that the Respondent has composed the disputed domain name by reproducing the well-known LANCÔME Trademark with the mere deletion of the final letter "e" and the addition of the term "beauty", which directly refers to the sector in which the Complainant and the LANCÔME brand operate for decades. A quick search for the term "lancome" online would have revealed to the Respondent the existence of the Complainant and its LANCÔME Trademark, which is inter alia registered in Iran (Islamic Republic of) where the Respondent is allegedly located. Taking into account the reputation of the Complainant's LANCÔME Trademark, registered long before the disputed domain name, and the Complainant's online presence, the Panel takes the view that the Respondent more likely than not was well aware of the Complainant's LANCÔME Trademark when it registered the disputed domain name and registered it with the intention to mislead Internet users into believing that the disputed domain name is affiliated with, or endorsed by, the Complainant. This conclusion is reinforced by the fact that, as explained above, the disputed domain name resolves to a website offering the same type of products as the Complainant, including products of the Complainant's competitors, which also supports a finding of bad faith. WIPO Overview 3.1, section 3.1.4.

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 <lancombeauty.ir> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Mireille Buydens /
Mireille Buydens
Sole Panelist
Date: October 26, 2026