

Domain Name Dispute Resolution Center (DNDRC)

Arbitration and Mediation Center

COMPLAINT PANEL DECISION

Case No. 2026-0003

Also in PDF C2026-0003

1. The Complainant

The Complainant is YesAsia Holdings Limited, having its office at 5/F, KC100, 100 Kwai Cheong Road, Kwai Chung, N.T. Hong Kong. The Complainant has initiated the Complaint vide their authorized representative, Ronald Tong & Co, with their address at Room 501, 5/F. Sun Hung Kai Centre 30 Harbour Road Hong Kong.

2. The Domain Name and Respondent

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

PKNIC has informed DNDRC that the DDN is registered by Muhammad Aslam Saqib, with the contact address at OF8-22 IT Tower Gulberg III, and that the email address provided at the time of registration of the DDN is websoulsdotcom@gmail.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 28 August 2025. DNDRC completed an administrative review of the Complaint and communicated the same to the Complainant on 30 August 2025.

Upon the Complainant’s fulfillment of the procedural obligations on 07 November 2025, DNDRC formally requested the Respondent’s registration details from PKNIC on 08 November 2025. PKNIC provided the requested details on 11 November 2025.

DNDRC issued a formal notification of the dispute to the Respondent on 13 November 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 Respondent submitted the Response via email on 20 November 2025. The Panel has decided to accept and consider the submission.

The Complaint, along with all relevant material, was referred to the appointed arbitrator for review and decision on 21 December 2025. The arbitrator completed the review and issued a decision on 16 January 2026. DNDRC, following the completion of the procedural obligations, transmitted the decision to the concerned parties on 17 January 2026.

Applying Paragraph 4(a) of the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the Rules), DNDRC appointed Mr. Muhamad Amaan Latif 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, namely YesAsia Holdings Limited, is a public company limited by shares incorporated in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China ("Hong Kong") whose shares are listed on The Stock Exchange of Hong Kong Limited (Stock Code: 2209.HK). The Complainant together with its subsidiaries (collectively, "YesAsia Group") are online retailers and wholesalers headquartered in Hong Kong which primarily engages in the procurement and sale of third party branded and unbranded Asian fashion & lifestyle, beauty and entertainment products to customers around the world via various global and well-known e-commerce platforms (including both business-to consumer (B2C) and business-to-business (B2B) e-commerce platforms). It operates, among other things, , ("YesStyle Website") as well as its corresponding mobile application ("YesStyle App").

Set out below are details of two principal subsidiaries of the Complainant which are relevant to the present complaint:

Name of subsidiary and its legal status	Place of incorporation	Date of incorporation	Principal business activities
YesAsia.com Limited <i>(private company limited by shares)</i> ("YesAsia.com")	Hong Kong	7 December 1998	Trading of entertainment products; investment holding and e-commerce B2C sales via www.YesAsia.com
YesStyle.com Limited <i>(private company limited by shares)</i> ("YesStyle.com")	Hong Kong	13 April 2006	Trading of beauty products, fashion and accessories; and E-commerce B2C sales via YesStyle Website and YesStyle App

A copy of the certificate of incorporation together with subsequent certificates of change of names in respect of the Complainant, YesAsia.com and YesStyle.com are enclosed herewith as exhibit 2 in pages 2-12 of the exhibit bundle. A copy of the Company Particulars Search in respect of each of YesAsia.com and YesStyle.com conducted at the online database of the Companies Registry of Hong Kong are enclosed herewith as exhibit 3 in pages 13-18 of the exhibit bundle, showing that the Complainant is the sole shareholder of YesStyle.com, and the majority shareholder of YesAsia.com.

The YesStyle Website and the corresponding YesStyle App are at all material time operated by YesStyle.com offering for the sale of Asian fashion & lifestyle products, and particularly Korean beauty products. Below is a summary of various key milestones in the development of YesAsia Group especially in relation to YesStyle Website and YesStyle App:

Timeline	Major developments and milestones
December 1997	Mr. Lau Kwok Chu and Ms. Chu Lai King started their business in California under the name Asia CD, Inc.
April 1998	The first e-commerce website of YesAsia Group known as <AsiaCD.com> was launched.
March 2000	Asia CD, Inc. changed its name to YesAsia.com, Inc.
April 2000	The website <AsiaCD.com> was changed to <www.YesAsia.com>.
June 2005	A series of corporate reorganization were completed where the Complainant was incorporated and became the investment holding company for all of the operating companies (including YesAsia.com) within YesAsia Group.
July 2006	YesStyle Website was launched.
May 2013	YesStyle Facebook account received “Like” exceeding 1 million.
May 2014	YesStyle App was launched.
December 2019	The number of YesStyle App downloads reached 3 million.
March 2020	Followers counts for YesStyle Instagram account exceeded 1 million.
July 2021	Shares of the Complainant were listed on Main Board of The Stock Exchange of Hong Kong Limited under Stock Code 02209, raising net proceeds (after deducting underwriting commissions and relevant expenses payable by the Complainant) of approximately HK\$92.3 million
30 August 2024	Complainant was included as a constituent in the MSCI Hong Kong Micro Cap Index
October 2024	Complainant won the Standard Chartered Bank Cross-border Corporate Outstanding Award
December 2024	Complainant was included in the Corporate Innovation Index by The Asia-Pacific Institute of Business at The Chinese University of Hong Kong

The Complainant hereby submits that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the PKNIC - Internet Domain Registration Policy version 4.4 (2019-08-19) (“PKNIC Policy”) and UDRP (defined in the next section) for a transfer of the Disputed Domain Name: -

- (i) *Illegality, unlawfulness and/or invalidity with respect to the application and registration of the Disputed Domain Name can be evidently shown.*

- (ii) *The Disputed Domain Name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's YesStyle Trade Marks as they incorporate such trade marks and the Complainant has rights in such Complainant's YesStyle Trade Marks through trademark registrations in the name of the Complainant's wholly-owned subsidiaries.*
- (iii) *The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name as the Complainant and/or its subsidiaries owns the Complainant's YesStyle Trade Marks as early as since 2006, and has registered and operated the YesStyle Website also since 2006. The Complainant has not authorized or consented to the Respondent to use or register the Disputed Domain Name.*
- (iv) *The Disputed Domain Name was registered and is being used in bad faith and the Respondent deliberately registered the Disputed Domain Name for unlawful financial benefits.*

Further details including the factual and legal grounds of the Complaint is set out in the next section.

A. THE PKNIC POLICY

The PKNIC Policy states that it creates an exception for, and thus excludes the registration of a domain name that: "a. infringes upon a registered tradename; b. is not bona fide as recognized by international best practice; c. in the opinion of PKNIC, a contravention of the latest version of the Pakistan Penal Code Act, 1860 (including offences of defamation & blasphemy)/ Anti-Terrorism Act, 1997/any applicable criminal law; d. has been declared by a Criminal Court of appropriate jurisdiction to have contravened the latest version of Pakistan Penal Code Act, 1860 (including offences of defamation & blasphemy)/Anti Terrorism Act, 1997/any applicable criminal law); or e. in the opinion of PKNIC is not appropriate for registration."

According to previous DNDRC decisions, for the purpose of assessing illegality, unlawfulness or otherwise invalidity of the application and registration of the Disputed Domain Name, the following criteria is considered: (i) whether the Disputed Domain Name infringes upon a registered trade name / trade mark; (ii) whether the application and/or registration of the Disputed Domain Name is bona fide; or (iii) whether the application and/or registration of the Disputed Domain Name contravenes the Pakistan Penal Code, 1860 or any applicable criminal law.

As regards criterion (i) above, the Complainant has registered the YesStyle Trade Marks, among other things, in Class 35 under the Nice Classification in Hong Kong, the USA and the EU. As more specifically averred in paragraph (i) under Part B of this Section 8 below, the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's YesStyle Trade Marks. Further, the Disputed Domain Name is purportedly used as an e-commerce platform, offering all kinds of beauty and personal care products (such as skincare, haircare, cosmetics products and tools etc.) at discounted prices. Such goods and services offered via the Disputed Domain Name is identical to or confusingly similar to the goods and services registered under the Complainant's YesStyle Trade Marks. In the premises, it is evident that the Disputed Domain Name infringes the Complainant's YesStyle Trade Marks.

As regards criterion (ii) above, the Respondent is not affiliated with, authorized or licensed by the Complainant to use any of the Complainant's YesStyle Trade Marks or register the Disputed Domain Name incorporating it. The Disputed Domain Name also fails to give a disclaimer clarifying its non-affiliation with the Complainant, thus misleading internet users into believing that there is such an affiliation. As such, the Complainant avers that the application and/or registration of the Disputed Domain Name is not bona fide in all aspects.

To conclude, it is apparent that the Respondent knew or should have known that the application and/or registration of the Disputed Domain Name establishes and constitutes the infringement of the Complainant's YesStyle Trade Marks, which renders the application and/or registration of the Disputed Domain Name illegal and unlawful in all aspects.

Therefore, the Complainant seeks the following remedy:

The Complainant requests that the Disputed Domain Name be transferred to the Complainant.

(b) Respondent

The Respondent has not made any submissions.

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 DDN 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

In the landmark case of *Standard Chartered PLC v. Hosting Campus Domain* (case no. C2007-0001) available on the DNDRC website (http://www.dndrc.com/cases_resolved/pdf/c20070001.pdf), the Panel laid down the following four heads under which to analyze cases, under the Internet Domain Registration Policy version 4.4 (2019-08-19) and the UDRP:

1. *Illegality, unlawfulness or otherwise invalidity of the Application & Registration (a criteria in terms of the PKNIC - Internet Domain Registration Policy June 20, 2006 version 4.1 in addition to the criteria of the UDRP)*
2. *Identical or confusing similarity to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (a UDRP criteria)*
3. *Legitimate interest in Domain Name (a UDRP criteria)*
4. *Registration and use in bad faith (a UDRP criteria)*

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

- i. Illegality, unlawfulness or otherwise invalidity with respect to the Application & Registration (a PKNIC - Internet Domain Registration Policy version 4.4 (2019-0819) criteria).
- ii. Identical or confusing similarity with a trademark or service in which the Complainant has rights (a UDRP criteria).
- iii. Legitimate interest in the domain name (a UDRP criteria).
- iv. Registration and use of the domain name in bad faith (a UDRP criteria).

I. Illegality, unlawfulness or otherwise invalidity of the Application & Registration

The PKNIC - Internet Domain Registration Policy version 4.4 (2019-08-19) states that it creates an exception for, and thus excludes the registration of a domain name that:

- a. infringes upon a registered tradename,*
- b. is not bona fide as recognized by international best practice,*
- c. in the opinion of PKNIC, a contravention of the latest version of the Pakistan Penal Code Act, 1860 (including offences of defamation & blasphemy)/ Anti-Terrorism Act, 1997/any applicable criminal law,*
- d. has been declared by a Criminal Court of appropriate jurisdiction to have contravened the latest version of Pakistan Penal Code Act, 1860 (including offences of defamation & blasphemy)/Anti-Terrorism Act, 1997/any applicable criminal law), or*
- e. in the opinion of PKNIC is not appropriate for registration.*

As per the PKNIC - Internet Domain Registration Policy version 4.4 (2019-08-19),

If a party claims that a domain name already registered with PKNIC violates their registered tradename, an obvious derivation of their registered company name is not bona fide as recognized by international best practice, and is a contravention in the opinion of PKNIC to be a contravention of the latest version of the Pakistan Penal Code Act, 1860 (including offences of defamation & blasphemy)/ Anti-Terrorism Act, 1997/any applicable criminal law, PKNIC reserves the right to cancel, or transfer the domain to the claiming party as per the ICANN's Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy [UDRP] (with PKNIC amendments) or as per the orders of a court judgment in Pakistan.

Therefore, for the purpose of assessing illegality, unlawfulness or otherwise invalidity of the Application & Registration of the DDN, the application and registration of the DDN shall be assessed in consideration of the following criteria:

- i. Whether the DDN infringes upon a registered trade name / trademark?*
- ii. Whether the application and/or registration of the DDN is bona fide?*
- iii. Whether the application and/or registration of the DDN contravenes the Pakistan Penal Code, 1860 (the “Penal Code”) or any applicable criminal law?*

The Complainant has made the following submissions:

The Complainant has via its subsidiaries YesAsia.com and YesStyle.com registered, own and maintain registrations of various trade marks bearing the word “YESSTYLE” and its variants in the People’s Republic of China (“PRC”), Hong Kong, the United States of

America (“USA”) and the European Union (“EU”) in respect of a wide range of goods and services, including but not limited to the following:

- (1) trade mark registration no. 300636039 registered under YesAsia.com on 10 May 2006 for “ ” in Classes 16, 35 and 39 in Hong Kong, which is registered for (i) printed matter and printed publications, including magazines, books, bookmarkers, posters; all included in Class 16; (ii) electronic retailing services via a computer and/or on the Internet, telephonic ordering services, mail catalogue services; retail services, import and export services, computerised information services relating to advertising, professional business consultancy services, all related to cosmetic products, skincare products, clothing, intimate wear, sportswear, footwear, bags, headgear, jewelry products, watches, precious metal, ornamental objects, home decoration products, housewares, electronics, bath and bedding products, books, magazines, gifts, souvenirs, fashion accessories; all included in Class 35; and (iii) transport; packaging and storage of goods; delivery and distribution (transport) of all kinds of goods; parcel delivery; all included in Class 39;*
- (2) trade mark registration no. 13005562A registered under YesStyle.com on 28 June 2015 for “YESSTYLE” in Class 18 in the PRC, which is registered for 鞭子; 鞍具 (English translation: Whips; Saddle);*
- (3) trade mark registration no. 13005562 registered under YesStyle.com on 7 May 2016 for “YESSTYLE” in Class 18 in the PRC, which is registered for 半加工或未加工皮革; 仿皮革; 毛皮; 行李箱; 旅行包; 女用阳伞; 伞; 手杖 (English translation: Semi processed or unprocessed leather; Imitation leather; Fur; Luggage; Travel bags; Women’s umbrellas; Umbrellas; Walking stick);*
- (4) trade mark registration no. 13005561A registered under YesStyle.com on 13 March 2016 for “YESSTYLE” in Class 25 in the PRC, which is registered for 帽 (English translation: hat);*
- (5) trade mark registration no. 13005561 registered under YesStyle.com on 29 May 2016 for “YESSTYLE” in Class 25 in the PRC, which is registered for 服装; 鞋 (English translation: Clothing; Shoes);*
- (6) trade mark registration no. 3304722 registered under YesStyle.com on 2 October 2007 for “YESSTYLE” in International Class 035-Primary Class and U.S. Classes*

100, 101, 102 in the USA, which is registered for online retail store and online ordering services in the fields of cosmetic products, skincare products, clothing, intimate wear, sportswear, footwear, bags, headgear, jewelry products, watches, precious metal, ornamental objects, home decoration products, housewares, electronics, bath and bedding products, books, gifts, souvenirs, fashion accessories; and

(7) trade mark filing number no. 008599201 registered under YesStyle.com on 18 June 2010 for “YESSTYLE” in Nice Class 35 and Vienna Classification 25.05.94, 29.01.03, 29.01.08 in the EU, which is registered for online retail service and physical retail stores featuring cosmetic products, skincare products, clothing, intimate wear, sportswear, footwear, bags, headgear, jewellery products, watches, precious metal, ornamental objects, namely ornamental figurines and ornamental sculptures, home decoration products, namely wall decorations, decorative lights, floral decorations, household articles made of cane, cork, plastic, reed, wicker or wood for decorations purposes, household paint and wallpaper, decorations of paper of plastic material, housewares, electronics, bath and bedding products, books, magazines, gifts, souvenirs, fashion accessories.

(collectively referred to as “Complainant’s YesStyle Trade Marks”, out of which trade mark set out under (1) be referred to as “YesStyle HK Trade Mark”, trade marks set out under (2)-(5) be collectively referred to as “YesStyle PRC Trade Marks” and trade marks set out under (6)-(7) be collectively referred to as “YesStyle EU & USA Trade Marks”).

Copies of the respective registration certificates and/or printout of the online records in respect of the Complainant’s YesStyle Trade Marks are enclosed as exhibit 4 in pages 19-33 of the exhibit bundle.

The Respondent has not made any submissions.

For the purposes of this criterion, it must be established that the Complainant has trademark rights. In this regard, the Panel notes that the Complainant, through its subsidiaries YesAsia.com and YesStyle.com, has demonstrated ownership of multiple registered trademarks incorporating the mark “YESSTYLE” across several jurisdictions, including Hong Kong, the People’s Republic of China (“PRC”), the United States of America (“USA”), and the European Union (“EU”).

The Complainant has submitted evidence showing that the YesStyle mark has been registered and used in connection with a broad range of goods and services, particularly in the field of online retail and e-commerce. Notably, the Complainant owns Hong Kong trademark registration no.

300636039, registered on 10 May 2006, covering Classes 16, 35, and 39, which includes printed publications, electronic retailing services, and logistics and delivery services. This registration evidence early and continuous protection of the YesStyle mark in connection with commercial activities central to the Complainant's business.

In addition, the Complainant holds multiple registrations in the PRC, including trademark registration numbers 13005562A and 13005562 in Class 18, as well as registration numbers 13005561A and 13005561 in Class 25. These registrations, dating from 2015 and 2016, cover goods such as leather products, luggage, clothing, footwear, and headgear. Collectively, these registrations demonstrate the Complainant's established trademark rights in a key commercial jurisdiction and across relevant product categories.

The Complainant has further established trademark rights in the USA through trademark registration no. 3304722, registered on 2 October 2007, covering online retail stores and online ordering services for a wide variety of consumer goods. Similarly, the Complainant owns EU trademark registration no. 008599201, registered on 18 June 2010, for online and physical retail services in Class 35. These registrations confirm that the YesStyle Market enjoys protection in major international markets and is used in connection with extensive retail and commercial services.

The Panel observes that there is no evidence on record disputing the validity, subsistence, or ownership of these registrations. Accordingly, the Panel is satisfied that the Complainant has established registered trademark rights in the "YESSTYLE" mark for the purposes of the Policy and has satisfied this criterion.

For sake of discussion, the Panel will consider the remaining substantive criteria under the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) to ascertain whether they have been met.

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

The Complainant has made the following submissions:

- i) *The disputed domain name(s) is/are identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights:*

The Complainant avers that the Disputed Domain Name is identical or confusingly similar to the Complainant's YesStyle Trade Marks in the following ways: -

1. *The Disputed Domain Name embodies, without the consent of the Complainant, the entirety of YesStyle HK Trade Mark (except for removing the “.com” therein), followed by the country code top-level domain (“ccTLD”) of “.pk”.*
2. *Moreover, the Disputed Domain Name embodies, without the consent of the Complainant, the entirety of YesStyle PRC Trade Marks and YesStyle EU & USA Trade Marks, followed by the ccTLD of “.pk”.*

As seen from the above, the Disputed Domain Name is extrinsically and confusingly similar to Complainant’s YesStyle Trade Marks visually, phonetically and conceptually. The “yesstyle” portion of the Disputed Domain Name, which is the Complainant’s YesStyle Trade Marks, is the first and only feature of the Disputed Domain Name. The inclusion of the ccTLD of “.pk” (representing Pakistan) does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity with the Complainant’s YesStyle Trade Marks, which remains clearly recognizable in the Disputed Domain Name.

The Disputed Domain Name is purportedly used as an e-commerce platform, offering all kinds of beauty and personal care products (such as skincare, haircare, cosmetics products and tools etc.). Such goods and services offered by the Disputed Domain Name is identical to or confusingly similar to the registered classes of services of the Complainant’s YesStyle Trade Marks, among other things, in Class 35 under the Nice Classification in Hong Kong, the USA and the EU.

Further, as mentioned in the Section 7 above, the Complainant via its wholly-owned subsidiary YesStyle.com has been operating the YesStyle Website for over 18 years as its e-commerce platform offering, among other things, beauty products including skincare and cosmetic products. As such, the public is likely to draw immediate inference to the Complainant when accessing the Disputed Domain Name (being confusingly similar to the Complainant’s YesStyle Trade Marks) which is displayed as an e-commerce platform for beauty products being similar, if not identical, to the services covered under the registration of the Complainant’s YesStyle Trade Marks.

Therefore, the use of the Disputed Domain Name as such is very likely to cause confusion on the part of the public to associate the Disputed Domain Name with the Complainant’s YesStyle Trade Marks. The confusion, in particular, being whether the Disputed Domain Name is a genuine and official domain name operated and registered by the Complainant in Pakistan or not.

Therefore, the Complainant avers that it has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(i) of the UDRP.

The Respondent has not made any submissions.

The Complainant contends that the DDN is identical or confusingly similar to its YESSTYLE trademarks, as it incorporates the mark “YESSTYLE” in its entirety, with the only difference being the addition of the country-code top-level domain (ccTLD) “.pk”. The Complainant submits that the DDN reproduces the whole of its registered YesStyle trademarks without authorization, and that such reproduction is sufficient to establish confusing similarity under paragraph 4(a)(i) of the UDRP.

The Panel observes that the dominant and only distinctive element of the DDN is the term “yesstyle”, which is identical to the Complainant’s registered trademarks. The addition of the ccTLD “.pk”, representing Pakistan, does not serve to distinguish the DDN from the Complainant’s mark and is a technical requirement of domain name registration.

In assessing confusing similarity, the Panel refers to section 1.7 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, which confirms that the first element of the UDRP is a threshold standing test involving a straightforward comparison between the complainant’s trademark and the DDN. Where a domain name incorporates a trademark in its entirety, confusing similarity is generally found. In line with section 1.11.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, the ccTLD “.pk” is disregarded for the purpose of this comparison.

The Panel further notes the Complainant’s submission that the DDN is being used as an e-commerce platform offering beauty and personal care products, which are identical or highly similar to the goods and services covered by the Complainant’s YesStyle trademarks, particularly those registered in Class 35. This reinforces the likelihood that internet users would assume an association between the DDN and the Complainant, including an impression that the domain is an official or authorized Pakistani platform of the Complainant.

The Respondent has not submitted any response and has therefore failed to rebut the Complainant’s assertions or provide any explanation for its choice of DDN.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the DDN is identical to a trademark in which the Complainant has rights and that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(i) of the UDRP.

III. 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:

ii) *The Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the domain name(s):*

Paragraph 4(c) of the UDRP provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name for purposes of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP, which are: -

“4(c)(i) before any notice to [the respondent] of the dispute, [the respondent’s] use of, or demonstrable preparations to use, the [disputed] domain name or a name corresponding to the [disputed] domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services; or

4(c)(ii) [the respondent] (as an individual, business, or other organization) [has] been commonly known by the [disputed] domain name, even if [the respondent has] acquired no trademark or service mark rights; or

4(c)(iii) [the respondent is] making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the [disputed] domain name, without intent for commercial gain to misleadingly divert consumers or to tarnish the trademark or service mark at issue.”

The Complainant avers there is a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in respect of the Disputed Domain Name for the following reasons:-

- 1. Referring to paragraph 4(c)(i) of the UDRP, the Complainant avers that the Respondent is not affiliated with, authorized or licensed by the Complainant to use the Complainant's YesStyle Trade Marks or register the Disputed Domain Name incorporating it. In the meantime, the Disputed Domain Name also fails to give a disclaimer clarifying its non affiliation with the Complainant, thus misleading internet users into believing that there is such an affiliation, which is false in all aspects. In the absence of any license or permission from the Complainant to use the Complainant's YesStyle Trade Marks, and without giving a proper disclaimer to disassociate the Respondent from the Complainant, no actual or contemplated bona fide or legitimate use of the Disputed Domain Name could be reasonably claimed.*
- 2. Further, the Disputed Domain Name has made extensive use of the Complainant's YesStyle Trade Marks to offer a wide range of goods or services which are identical to or confusingly similar to the registered classes of services of the Complainant's YesStyle Trade Marks and offered by the Complainant, especially those offered via the YesStyle Website and YesStyle App E-commerce platform. The Respondent's unauthorized, deceptive and illegitimate use of the Complainant's YesStyle Trade Marks as illustrated below could not give rise to a right or legitimate interest on the Respondent in the Disputed Domain Name:-*
 - a) First, without the consent or authorization of the Complainant, a sign comprising of the English characters "YESSTYLE" ("Sign") appears at the header on every page of the Disputed Domain Name. Moreover, the product shots on the front page of the Disputed Domain Name are imprinted with the word "Yesstyle.pk" ("Slogan") (please see exhibit 5 in page 34 of the exhibit bundle). The Sign and Slogan are confusingly similar to the Complainant's YesStyle Trade Marks and are used in the course of trade or business that is opened to general public in every part of the world (in particular, Pakistan) which is similar to what the Complainant's YesStyle Trade Marks are registered for.*
 - b) Second, without the consent or authorization of the Complainant, the Respondent uses the Complainant's YesStyle Trade Marks to promote the products offered in the Disputed Domain Name. In particular, statements such as (i) "Yesstyle.pk Deal's in 100 % Original Makeup & Skin Care Products only from USA...", (ii) "YesStyle.pk brings you the finest Korean skincare products, Discover the*

secret to fresh, flawless beauty—only at YesStyle.pk!” and (iii) “Shop affordable lipsticks at YesStyle.pk!” are found in the Website (please see exhibit 6 in pages 35-37 of the exhibit bundle, highlighted). The above statements are designed to give the false impression to internet users that the Disputed Domain Name is an official and genuine site of the Complainant and one that is offering shortlisted products supplied and/or retailed by the Complainant.

- c) For the above reasons, the Respondent would not have a right or legitimate interest in the Disputed Domain Name which is used to perpetrate such deceptions.*
3. *Regarding paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the UDRP, according to the WHOIS search, the Disputed Domain Name was registered on 28 August 2024 (i.e. exhibit 1). In other words, the Disputed Domain Name was registered well after the Complainant’s first use and registration the Complainant’s YesStyle Trade Marks as and from 2006. Given the short registration history of the Disputed Domain Name, the Respondent cannot not be commonly known by the Disputed Domain Name.*
4. *Regarding paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the UDRP, as averred in paragraph (i) under Part B of this Section 8(i) above, the Disputed Domain Name is purportedly used as an e-commerce platform that offers the sale of all kinds of beauty products (such as skincare, haircare, cosmetics products and tools etc.). As such, it is apparent that the Disputed Domain Name is created with the intent for commercial gain and to misleadingly divert consumers of the Complainant or to tarnish the Complainant’s YesStyle Trade Marks.*

Therefore, the Complainant avers that the Respondent has failed to demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in the Disputed Domain Name, and the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP.

The Respondent has not made any submissions.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the DDN. The Complainant submits that it has not licensed, authorized, or otherwise permitted the Respondent to use its YESSTYLE trademarks or to register the DDN incorporating those marks. The Complainant further argues that the Respondent’s use of the DDN falsely suggests an affiliation with the Complainant and lacks any disclaimer clarifying the absence of such a relationship.

Pursuant to paragraph 4(c) of the UDRP, a respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests by showing, inter alia, use of the domain name in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services, that it is commonly known by the domain name, or that it is making a legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the domain name. In accordance with section 2.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, the Complainant is required to establish a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks such rights or legitimate interests, after which the burden of production shifts to the Respondent.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established a prima facie case. The Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant and has not been authorized to use the YESSTYLE mark. The DDN is used as an e-commerce platform offering beauty and personal care products that are identical or highly similar to those offered by the Complainant under its YesStyle trademarks. Such use, which trades on the goodwill of the Complainant's mark, cannot constitute a bona fide offering of goods or services under paragraph 4(c)(i) of the Policy.

The Panel further notes that the Respondent makes prominent and repeated use of the YESSTYLE mark on the website associated with the DDN, including displaying "YESSTYLE" in the website header and using statements such as "YesStyle.pk brings you the finest Korean skincare products" and "100% Original Makeup & Skin Care Products." These representations are designed to give internet users the false impression that the website is an official or authorized platform of the Complainant. Such deceptive use of another party's trademark does not give rise to rights or legitimate interests.

With respect to paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy, there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the DDN. The records show that the DDN was registered in August 2024, long after the Complainant's longstanding use and registration of the YESSTYLE trademarks dating back to at least 2006. The Respondent has provided no evidence to suggest that it is known by the name "YesStyle" in any legitimate capacity.

The Panel also finds that the Respondent's use does not fall within paragraph 4(c)(iii) of the Policy.

The DDN is clearly being used for commercial gain as an online retail platform, with the apparent intent to misleadingly divert consumers seeking the Complainant's official YesStyle website. Such conduct cannot be characterized as legitimate noncommercial or fair use.

The Respondent has not submitted any response and has therefore failed to rebut the Complainant's prima facie case or demonstrate any rights or legitimate interests therefore, the Panel finds that the

Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the DDN and that the Complainant has satisfied paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the UDRP.

IV. Registration and use in bad faith

The Complainant has made the following submissions:

The disputed domain name(s) has/have been registered and is/are being used in bad faith: Paragraph 4(b) of the UDRP specifies circumstances that shall be evidence of registration and use of a domain name in bad faith. In particular, the Complainant refers to the following subsections:

“(iii) an entity registered the domain name primarily for the purpose of disrupting the business of a competitor; and

(iv) by using the domain name, you have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to your website or other on-line location, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of your website or location or of a product or service on your website or location.”

The Complainant avers that the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and is being used in bad faith for the following reasons: -

- 1. The Complainant’s rights to the Complainant’s YesStyle Trade Marks substantially precede the Respondent’s registration of the Disputed Domain Name, which only occurred on 28 August 2024. The Respondent has also used the Complainant’s YesStyle Trade Marks on the Website for the same area of business operated by the Complainant.*
- 2. In the meantime, at the front page of the Website, two hyperlink buttons (“Hyperlink Buttons”) are attached to redirect the users to the respective Facebook and Instagram accounts of the Website (please see exhibit 7 in page 38 of the exhibit bundle). The said Facebook account (please see exhibit 8 in pages 39-44 of the exhibit bundle) and Instagram account (please see exhibit 9 in pages 45-47 of the exhibit bundle) both contains a hyperlink which redirects the users to the Disputed Domain Name. In the meantime, the Complainant’s YesStyle Trade Marks are used as the profile picture of the said Facebook and Instagram account.*

3. *Accordingly, the Hyperlink Buttons that direct the users to a Facebook or Instagram account adopting the Complainant's YesStyle Trade Marks as its profile picture, combined with the overall presentation of the Website to be a website operated by an entity known as "YESSTYLE" by incorporating a sign similar to the Complainant's YesStyle Trade Marks, are deliberate attempts to mislead the public into believing that the Disputed Domain Name is operated by YesStyle.com or the Complainant and/or otherwise affiliated or associated with YesStyle.com and/or otherwise in certain business cooperation or relationship with YesStyle.com and/or the Complainant, which is inaccurate in all respects.*
4. *In the view of the evidence presented above, complemented with the Disputed Domain Name which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's YesStyle Trade Marks, it is apparent that the Respondent had or ought to have knowledge of the Complainant's prior rights in the Complainant's YesStyle Trade Marks. By the registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name, the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, internet users to the Website by creating a likelihood of confusion with the the Complainant's Trade Marks. As a result of the registration and use of the Disputed Domain Name, the Website benefit from the affiliation or endorsement associated with the Complainant's Trade Marks. Hence, an inference that the Disputed Domain Name has been registered and are being used in bad faith can be logically drawn.*

Therefore, the Complainant avers that the Complainant has satisfied the paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the UDRP.

The Respondent has made the following submissions:

I am the lawful registrant of the domain [yesstyle.pk](https://www.yesstyle.pk), which I purchased and registered approximately one year ago through the PKNIC registry. At the time of registration, the domain name was publicly available and no prior claim or restriction was indicated in the registry records.

I would like to clarify that I had no intention to infringe upon any existing trademark or brand. I was unaware that "YesStyle" was an established brand name associated with a company operating internationally. Additionally, the domain [yesstyle.pk](https://www.yesstyle.pk) has not been used to sell, promote, or imitate the complainant's products or services, nor has it been used in any misleading or deceptive manner.

My purpose in registering this domain was to develop an independent project unrelated to the complainant's business activities. However, if the complainant company wishes to acquire the domain, I am open to resolving this matter amicably through a mutually agreed transfer.

I remain fully cooperative with the DNDRC process and am committed to resolving this dispute in good faith and in accordance with PKNIC's policies.

The Complainant asserts that the DDN has been registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant submits that its rights in the YESSTYLE trademarks substantially predate the Respondent's registration of the DDN on 28 August 2024. The DDN incorporates the Complainant's mark in its entirety and is being used as an e-commerce platform offering beauty and personal care products identical or highly similar to those offered by the Complainant. The Complainant further notes that the website linked to the DDN features hyperlinks to Facebook and Instagram accounts using the YESSTYLE mark as profile pictures, creating the false impression of affiliation or endorsement by the Complainant.

The Panel observes that Paragraph 4(b) of the UDRP specifies circumstances that are indicative of registration and use in bad faith, including registration primarily to disrupt a competitor's business or to attract internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion with a trademark. In this case, the Respondent was aware, or ought to have been aware, of the Complainant's longstanding rights in the YESSTYLE trademarks, and used the mark to benefit from the reputation and goodwill associated with the Complainant. The overall presentation of the website, the use of the YESSTYLE mark, and the social media accounts linked to the DDN are designed to mislead users into believing that the site is operated by or affiliated with the Complainant.

The Respondent contends that it lawfully acquired the DDN when it became publicly available, that it was unaware of the Complainant's YESSTYLE trademarks at the time of registration, and that the DDN was intended for an independent project unrelated to the Complainant. The Panel finds these assertions unconvincing. Given the worldwide recognition of the YESSTYLE mark and its long standing use in global e-commerce, it is highly unlikely that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's trademark rights at the time of registration. As noted in section 3.2.2 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, where a mark is widely known, panels have consistently found that a respondent's claim of lack of knowledge is not credible and supports a finding of bad faith.

Furthermore, while the Respondent asserts that the DDN was registered for an independent project, it has provided no evidence whatsoever of any demonstrable preparations or legitimate business plan supporting this claim. Mere assertions of intended independent use, without corroborating evidence, are insufficient to establish rights or legitimate interests under the Policy, as reflected in section 2.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.0. The absence of any credible explanation as to how the Respondent independently conceived the distinctive and non-dictionary term “YesStyle” further undermines its position and reinforces the inference that the DDN was selected to target the Complainant’s mark.

Finally, despite asserting legitimate interest, the Respondent simultaneously states that it is open to transferring the DDN to the Complainant on “mutually agreed transfer.” The Panel notes that such language implies a transfer in exchange for monetary or other valuable consideration. As the Respondent had no rights in the DDN, proposing a negotiated transfer strongly suggests that the DDN was registered primarily for resale to the trademark owner for profit. This conduct constitutes an additional indicator of bad faith under section 3.1.1 of the WIPO Overview 3.0, which recognizes that registration of a domain name primarily for sale to the trademark owner is evidence of bad faith.

Accordingly, the Panel finds that the DDN has been registered and is being used in bad faith, and that the Complainant has satisfied the requirements of Paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the UDRP

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 finds that the Complainant has demonstrated registered and common law trademark rights in the name “**YesStyle**”. The Respondent has not demonstrated any corresponding rights or legitimate interests in the DDN. The Panel concludes that the Respondent's registration and passive holding of the DDN, <yesstyle.pk>, infringes on the Complainant's rights and was done in bad faith.

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

1. The Respondent’s registration of the DDN contravenes the PKNIC - Internet Domain Registration Policy version 4.4 (2019-08-19);
2. The DDN is identical to the registered trademark of the Complainant;
3. The Respondent has no legitimate interest in the DDN;
4. The DDN was registered and is being used in bad faith.

Pursuant to Section 4 of the Policy, the Panel therefore directs that the registration of the DDN <yesstyle.pk> be transferred to the Complainant, as requested, within forty-eight (48) hours of receipt of this decision, either by email or through its publication on the official website www.dndrc.com/cases_resolved/, whichever is earlier. The Complainant shall also remain entitled to approach PKNIC directly for enforcement of this decision.

Arbitrator: Muhammad Amaan Latif

Sole Panelist

Date: 16 January 2026