Domain Name Dispute Resolution Center (DNDRC)

Arbitration and Mediation Center

COMPLAINT PANEL DECISION

Case No. 2026-0006

Also in PDF C2026-0006

1. The Complainant

The Complainant is RECKITT & COLMAN (OVERSEAS) HEALTH LIMITED, having its office at 103 - 105 BATH ROAD, SLOUGH, BERKSHIRE, SL1 3UH, UNITED KINGDOM. The Complainant has initiated the complaint via their authorized representative, STUDIO BARBERO S.P.A. having their office at CORSO MASSIMO D'AZEGLIO 57, 10126, TORINO, ITALY.

2. The Domain Name and Respondent

The domain name upon which the Complaint is based upon is <veetacademy.com.pk>, is hereinafter referred to as the Disputed Domain Name [DDN].

PKNIC has informed DNDRC that the DDN is registered by convex with the contact name Aamir Irfan, with their address at Suite No 803; 8th floor; Ibrahim Trade Tower and that the email address provided at the time of registration of the DDN is aamir@convexinteractive.com.

3. Procedural History

DNDRC was informed of the Complaint against the Respondent in accordance with the PKNIC - Internet Domain Registration Policy upon receiving notification from the Complainant on 05 December 2025. An administrative review of the Complaint was conducted and completed on 12 December 2025, following which the Complainant was notified of the compliance review's completion and the subsequent procedural requirements on the same day.

Upon the Complainant's fulfillment of the procedural requirements on 19 December 2025, DNDRC formally requested the Respondent's registration details from PKNIC on 22 December 2025. PKNIC provided the requested details on 23 December 2025.

DNDRC issued a formal notification of the dispute to the Respondent on 29 December 2025, enclosing a copy of the Complaint and a Response Form, informing the Respondent that failure to submit a Response within 10 days would result in the dispute proceeding ex parte.

The Complaint along with all relevant material was referred to the appointed arbitrator for review and decision on 12 January 2025. The arbitrator completed the review and issued a decision on 24 February 2026. DNDRC, following the completion of the procedural obligations, transmitted the decision to the concerned parties on 24 February 2026.

Applying Paragraph 4(a) of the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the *Rules*), DNDRC appointed Mr. Ardavan D. Solan as the sole Arbitrator who has verified that the Complaint satisfies the formal requirements of the Policy and the Rules.

Factual Background

4. Parties Contentions

(a) Complainant

The Complainant's brief contentions are reproduced below:

The Complainant

Complainant is Reckitt & Colman (Overseas) Health Limited, belonging to the Reckitt group of companies (hereinafter referred to as "Reckitt"). Reckitt is a global leader in consumer health, hygiene, home and nutrition products.

The history of the Reckitt began in 1819 when Isaac and Thomas Reckitt built the Maud Foster Mill in Boston in Lincolnshire. In 1823 Johann A. Benckiser founded Benckiser, an industrial chemicals business. Reckitt & Colman and Benckiser merged in 1999 to become Reckitt Benckiser Plc.

Reckitt manufactures and markets health, personal care and household products, including over-the-counter pharmaceuticals such as analgesics, antiseptics, flu remedies and gastrointestinal medications and products for hair removal, denture cleaning, intimate wellness and pest control.

Reckitt has more than 39.000 employees, operations in more than 60 countries and sales in most countries across the globe, including Pakistan, where Complainant operates via the subsidiary Reckitt Benckiser (Pakistan) Ltd. Its key brands include DETTOL, DUREX,

GAVISCON, NUROFEN, FINISH, HARPIC, STREPSILS, CLEARASIL, OPTREX, LYSOL and VANISH.

The trademark VEET has been used by the Complainant and its predecessors in rights to identify a hair removal product. Such product was originally manufactured by the Hannibal Pharmaceutical Company under the name "neet". The VEET mark was established in 1922 in the UK and was inspired by the French word "vite", meaning "quickly". The product was sold in Canada and the United States with its original name until 2002, when the VEET mark was first used commercially also in those countries.

VEET is number 1 depilatory brand worldwide and is commercialized in more than 80 countries, including Pakistan.

Complainant owns numerous gTLDs and ccTLDs, directly or via other companies of the Group, < reckitt.com> including , redirected to their main web portal – on which a page is specifically dedicated to VEET Veet | Reckitt.com -,<veet.com>, and <veet.com.pk> (Annex 8).

Factual and Legal Grounds

The Domain Name is redirected to a website publishing the VEET figurative trademark and promoting the "Veet Academy", an online course which aims to help young women in Pakistan in showing their potential. By clicking on the "start your journey" button, Internet users are redirected to a form to fill in with credentials (email and password) to access further content. Users can also create their account by filling in a form with personal information – including name and e-mail address – or using their Facebook or Google accounts. At the bottom of the website, a copyright disclaimer refers to Complainant and its Group "© 2025 Copyright Reckitt Benckiser. All Rights Reserved" (Annex 3).

In October 2025, after ascertaining that the Domain Name was not directly owned and controlled by Complainant or other Reckitt companies, Complainant instructed its representative in this proceeding to send a disclosure request to the .pk Registry, PKNIC, to ascertain the identity of the actual registrant and contact it to request the transfer of the Domain Name. Such disclosure request was sent on September 29, 2025 to PKNIC, which however refused to provide the registrant information (Annexes 4).

On October 08, 2025, Complainant's representative drafted a letter for Respondent in which it requested the transfer of the Domain Name to Complainant and sent it to PKNIC requesting to forward the communication to the registrant, in the absence of any contact *information in the public WHOIS records, but the Registry refused to transmit the letter to Respondent (Annex 5).*

On October 24, 2025, in a further effort to contact the actual domain holder, Complainant's representative sent a communication the hosting provider, as disclosed by Cloudflare Inc. on October 23, but no reply has been received (Annexes 6).

Considering the Domain Name is currently not registered and controlled by a Reckitt company and Respondent is not entitled to be the actual registrant of the Domain Name, which must be transferred to Reckitt as the legitimate owner of the VEET mark, Complainant instructed their representative to file the present Complaint in order to ascertain the actual identity of the current registrant of the Domain Name and obtain the transfer of the Domain Name under its ownership and control.

(b) Respondent

The Respondent did not make a submission.

5. Jurisdiction

The Panel's jurisdiction over this dispute between the Complainant and the Respondent is established by virtue of the Internet Domain Registration Policy version 4.4 (2019-08-19) and the Rules.

The Respondent applied for and was granted registration of the DN on the basis of these regulations, and has submitted to, the PKNIC - Internet Domain Registration Policy version 4.4 (2019-08-19) and the Rules and correspondingly to the arbitral jurisdiction of the DNDRC and its arbitration decisions.

6. Discussion and Findings

The decision of the dispute shall be addressed with respect to the following aspects:

I. Identical or confusing similarity with a trademark or service in which the Complainant has rights (a UDRP criteria).
II. Legitimate interest in the domain name (a UDRP criteria).
III. Registration and use of the domain name in bad faith (a UDRP criteria).

I. Identical or confusing similarity to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights

The Complainant has made the following submissions:

> *The Domain Name is confusingly similar to the trademark VEET in which Complainant has rights, as per trademark registrations in Annexes 2.*
>
> *As stated in section 1.8 of WIPO Overview 3.0, it is a well-established principle that a domain name that wholly incorporates a trademark is found to be confusingly similar for purposes of the Policy, despite the fact that the Domain Name may also contain other terms, whether descriptive, geographical, pejorative, meaningless, or otherwise.*
>
> *In the present case, the Domain Name entirely reproduces the trademark VEET with the mere addition of the generic term "academy". Such alteration is not sufficient to prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the first element. Indeed, the term "academy" is sometimes used by brand owners for websites giving information and education about their brands. It is therefore likely that consumers would view 'veetacademy' as a place for obtaining education and information about the VEET brand. See, along these lines, Cisco Technology, Inc. v. Mohammad Malik, WIPO Case No. D2024-2127: "Based on the above, the Panel finds that the added term "academy" does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and Complainant's CISCO Mark. Complainant's well-known CISCO Mark remains fully recognizable as incorporated in its entirety into the disputed domain name".*
>
> *As to the addition of the ccTLD ".com.pk", it does not affect the likelihood of confusion as it is necessary requirement for the registration of the domain name itself (see, among the others, DNDRC Case No. 2024-0013).*
>
> *In light of the above, it is clear that the Domain Name is confusingly similar to the prior registered trademarks in which Complainant has rights pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy.*

The Respondent has not submitted a response.

Based on the registered trademarks list provided in the Complaint, some of which are as longstanding as being registered in 1942, the Panel is well within its rights to deduce that the Complainant has a *bona fide* claim to the trademark. A plain review of the DDN reveals that the Complainant's trademark has been incorporated fully into it, with the simple addition of the term(s) "academy" and ".com.pk" the latter of which is a ccTLD.

Hence, an initial indication of confusing similarity between the DDN and the mark has been established (See WIPO Overview 3.0 Section 1.7). To further examine whether the additional suffix(s) can diminish such a finding, we shall consider the term; "academy" since the suffix of ".com.pk" is necessary for registering it in specific jurisdictions.

According to Section 1.8 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, the inclusion of generic terms like "academy" are considered as "descriptive" "meaningless" or "pejorative" and cannot diminish a finding of confusing similarity after it is found that the entire trademark has been incorporated into the domain name.

Due to the reasons above, the Panel finds the DDN to be confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark.

II. Legitimate interests in a domain name

As per paragraph 4(c), the UDRP requires the Respondent's claim to be of legitimate interest and shall be:

> "*proved based on all evidence presented"* that *"shall demonstrate"* the Respondent's "*rights or legitimate interests to the domain name for purposes of* Paragraph 4(a)(ii)*."*

Paragraph 4(c) states that:

> *"(i) before any notice to you of the dispute, your use of, or 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; or*
>
> *(ii) you (as an individual, business, or other organization) have been commonly known by the domain name, even if you have acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or*
>
> *(iii) you are making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue."*

The Complainant has made the following submissions:

> *According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, the burden of proving the absence of Respondent's rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name lies with Complainant. It is nevertheless a well-settled principle that satisfying this burden is unduly*

onerous, since proving a negative fact is logically less feasible than establishing a positive. Accordingly, it is sufficient for Complainant to produce prima facie evidence in order to shift the burden of production to Respondent. See section 2.1 of WIPO Overview 3.0 and, e.g., Document Technologies, Inc. v. International Electronic Communications Inc., WIPO Case No. D2000-0270; Belupo d.d. v. WACHEM d.o.o., WIPO Case No. D2004-0110.

To the best of Complainant's knowledge and in the absence of any information about the registrant of the Domain Name in the public Whois records, Respondent cannot be identified as a company belonging to the Reckitt Group and is not authorized to be the current registrant of the Domain Name. It is well-established that typically in the absence of any license or permission from a complainant to use a complainant's trademark, no bona fide or legitimate use of the domain name could reasonably be claimed. See, LEGO Juris A/S v. DomainPark Ltd, David Smith, Above.com, Domain Privacy, Transure Enterprise Ltd, Host master, WIPO Case No. D2010-0138. As stated, i.a. in Pharmacia & Upjohn Company v. Moreonline, WIPO Case No. D2000-0134 "the mere registration, or earlier registration, does not establish rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name". Along these lines, see also Amanresorts Limited v. WWW Enterprise, Inc., WIPO Case No. D2005-0384; N.C.P. Marketing Group, Inc. v. Entredomains, WIPO Case No. D2000-0387.

Complainant is not in possession of, nor aware of, the existence of any evidence demonstrating that Respondent - whose name is not disclosed in the public Whois records - might be commonly known by a name corresponding to the Domain Name as an individual, business, or other organization.

As described in the factual section and shown in Annexes 3, the Domain Name currently resolves to a website displaying the VEET figurative trademark and requesting Internet users to fill in a form with personal information to access further website content. Since the Domain Name is currently under control of an entity other than a Reckitt company, which currently has control over the Domain Name, Respondent's use of the Domain Name cannot amount to a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Indeed, the use of the Domain Name by Respondent may create confusion amongst internet users as to the source of the collection of their personal data, which users are requested to provide when visiting the website at the Domain Name and could potentially be used for unauthorized and infringing purposes. See, along these lines, Télévision Française 1 v. Serhii, Dev, WIPO Case No. D2025-0213: "The Panel further notes that the disputed domain name resolved to a website reproducing the trademark and logos of French online banks (Boursorama and Boursobank), or other news services (France 24), as well as financial press articles (including a suspicious article promising to every French citizen a monthly revenue of EUR 30,000/month). The use of such well-known trademarks and articles is such *as to inspire confidence in Internet users. The Panel notes that the website also contained a tab for entering personal data (a tab on the right side of the website entitled "Mes listes", "my lists" in English, which shows that one could get personalized information by entering personal data). It therefore appears that the Respondent used the disputed domain name to instill confidence among Internet users and gather personal information, which could be used for fraudulent activities".*

For all of the foregoing reasons, Complainant concludes that Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Domain Name pursuant to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.
Notwithstanding the above, since Complainant has exhausted all attempts to obtain the disclosure of the registrant contact information and it cannot be excluded that the Domain Name may have been registered by an external agency which had some collaboration with a Reckitt company in the past, Complainant requests Respondent, should it be an entity that actually cooperated with Reckitt and received authorization to register the Domain Name on behalf of Reckitt, to confirm its availability to transfer control of the Domain Name and of the correspondent website to Reckitt. In such a case, Complainant would be available to suspend the proceedings to implement a settlement with Respondent.

The Respondent has not submitted a response.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the DDN. In particular, the Complainant submits that the Respondent has not been licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted whether expressly or impliedly to use the Complainant's VEET trademark or to register a domain name incorporating that mark. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant or any company within the Reckitt Group and has never been granted permission to use the VEET mark in any manner.

Under established UDRP practice, panels recognize that requiring a complainant to prove the absence of a respondent's rights or legitimate interests would effectively amount to proving a negative. Accordingly, a complainant is required to establish a prima facie case that the respondent lacks such rights or legitimate interests, at which point the burden of production shifts to the respondent to demonstrate otherwise (see WIPO Overview 3.0, section 2.1) (WIPO Case No. D2015-1149).

In the present case, the Panel finds that the Complainant has successfully established a prima facie case under paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

First, the Complainant has neither licensed nor otherwise authorized the Respondent to use its VEET trademark. It is well established that, in the absence of authorization, the incorporation of a complainant's trademark in a domain name does not give rise to rights or legitimate interests. The DDN resolves to a website prominently displaying the Complainant's VEET figurative trademark and inviting Internet users to submit personal information through an online form in order to access further content. Such use does not constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy. Rather, the reproduction of the Complainant's trademark and overall presentation of the website create a misleading impression of affiliation or endorsement.

Secondly, there is no evidence that the Respondent is commonly known by the DDN or by the VEET mark within the meaning of paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy. The publicly available WHOIS information is redacted, and nothing in the record suggests that the Respondent has acquired any trademark or other rights corresponding to the DDN. Nor is there evidence of any independent reputation associated with the Respondent in connection with the term "VEET."

Thirdly, the Respondent is not making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the DDN without intent for commercial gain or to misleadingly divert consumers, pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy. On the contrary, the use of the DDN to display the Complainant's trademark and solicit personal data from Internet users carries a clear risk of confusion as to source, sponsorship, or affiliation. Such conduct cannot qualify as fair or legitimate use under the Policy.

In view of the foregoing, the burden of production has shifted to the Respondent to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the DDN. The Respondent has failed to submit any response or evidence to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case. (WIPO Case No. D2023-0299)

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the DDN, and the Complainant has therefore satisfied the second element of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

III. Registration and use in bad faith

The Complainant has made the following submissions:

> *In light of the prior registration and use of Complainant's trademark VEET worldwide, including on the internet, as detailed in the paragraphs above, Respondent was or should have been aware of the existence of Complainant's trademarks at the time of registration of the disputed Domain Name, which occurred only in January 2021.*
>
> *Respondent's actual knowledge of Complainant and its VEET trademark is demonstrated by the content published on the website www.veetacademy.com.pk, which includes the VEET figurative trademark. It is thus apparent that Respondent was actually aware of Complainant and its trademark when registered the Domain Name.*

As mentioned above, the Domain Name resolves to a website promoting a Veet Academy Online Course for young women in Pakistan, displaying the VEET trademarks and requesting users to fill in a form with their personal data to access further website content. As a result, the use of the Domain Name engenders confusion amongst Internet users as to the source of the acquisition of their personal data, which may be used for unauthorized and potentially infringing purposes, considering the Domain Name is not directly owned and controlled by Reckitt. As stated in Télévision Française 1 v. Serhii, Dev, WIPO Case No. D2025-0213, "The Respondent used the Complainant's well-known Trademark (along with other well-known French trademarks like Boursorama or France24) to instill confidence among Internet users and convince them to enter their personal data, which could be used for fraudulent purposes. This website does not contain any information allowing Internet users to identify the company operating the website. In light of this, it seems inconceivable that the Respondent would have registered and used the disputed domain name for a reason other than seeking to unduly benefit from the Complainant, its well-known TF1 Trademark, and associated goodwill."

In light of the above, Complainant respectfully submits that the Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith in full satisfaction of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy.

However, as indicated above, Complainant cannot exclude that Respondent may be an external agency which collaborated with a Reckitt company in the past. Should it be the case, Complainant will be open to settle the matter with Respondent, in case it confirms its availability to transfer control of the Domain Name and the correspondent website to Reckitt.

The Respondent has not submitted a response.

As evidenced by the mark, the choice of colour scheme, and the design style of the website it appears that the Respondent tried to copy or emulate them from the labelling and branding of the Complainant's already well known "Veet" products. In circumstances where the Complainant's mark is widely recognized, the Respondent cannot credibly claim to have been unaware of the Complainant's trademark. Therefore, the Respondent "knew or should have known" that registering a similar domain would create an identical or confusingly similar mark, which indicates registration in bad faith (see WIPO Overview 3.0, Section 3.2.2).

The website to which the DDN leads to, consists of an alleged online course aimed at empowering young women of Pakistan, along with a login or "start your journey", where users can enter their email address and password, or login via their Facebook or Google accounts. Since it is already established that the Complainant is not involved in regulating or running this website, and the copyright disclaimer at the bottom tries to insinuate the very opposite, leads the Panel to believe that this is an effort to instill confidence amongst internet users and convince them to enter their personal data, which could then be used for unauthorized, and potentially fraudulent purposes. All of the above, points towards the Respondent's intent to unduly benefit from the Complainant's goodwill as established in Télévision Française 1 v. Serhii, Dev WIPO Case No. D2025-0213.

The Panel deduces that the Respondent's intention of doing such, could only be to use the DDN's website for unauthorized and or fraudulent purposes. Assuming that the personal information provided by the internet user includes email addresses and passwords, the Respondent may even abuse the information provided to intiate; sending deceptive emails, phishing, identity theft, or malware distribution. This is also indicative of bad faith on behalf of the Respondent, as stated in the WIPO Overview 3.0, Section 3.4.

Accordingly, the Panel concludes that the Respondent both; registered, and is using the DDN in bad faith.

7. Decision

Upon reviewing the contentions and supporting evidence submitted by both Parties, the Panel finds that the Complainant has successfully established all elements required under the PKNIC - Internet Domain Registration Policy and the UDRP. The Panel recognizes that the "Veet" mark is registered to the Complainant and the Respondent has no legitimate rights over it. Therefore, the continuous use of the DDN pertaining to the Complainant's registered trademark could result in hinderance in exercise of the rights of the Complainant in the trademark and could also jeopardize the reputation of the Complainant by amounting to confusion regarding the ownership of the DDN.

Taking all the above discussions into consideration, the Panel concludes and decides that:

1. The DDN is confusingly similar to the registered trademark of the Complainant;
2. The Respondent has no legitimate interest in the DDN, and;
3. The DDN was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Pursuant to Section 4 of the Policy, the Panel, therefore, recommends that PKNIC transfer the registration of the DDN <veetacademy.com.pk> to the Complainant, as prayed, within 48 hours of receipt of this decision either by email or through its publication on the official website where it will be uploaded, www.dndrc.com/cases_resolved/, whichever is earlier. The Complainant shall also be at liberty to contact PKNIC for implementation of this decision.

Arbitrator: Ardavan D. Solan
Sole Panelist
Date: 24 February 2026