Decision for dispute CAC-UDRP-107305

Case number	CAC-UDRP-107305
Time of filing	2025-07-21 10:05:05
Domain names	tangleteazer.com

Case administrator

Organization	Iveta Špiclová (Czech Arbitration Court) (Case admin)

Complainant

Organization	TANGLE TEEZER LIMITED

Complainant representative

Organization	Coöperatie SNB-REACT U.A.

Respondent

Name	Aleksandr Pivovar

OTHER LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

The Panel is not aware of any other legal proceedings which are pending or decided and which relate to the disputed domain name.

IDENTIFICATION OF RIGHTS

The Complainant is the owner of the mark TANGLE TEEZER, which is subject to numerous trademark registrations around the world, including the following trademark registrations:

The EU trademark word registration no. 004345963 for TANGLE TEEZER, registered on 26 April 2006, for goods of classes 3, 21 and 25; in particular class 21 for ‘‘brushes’’ and ‘‘combs’’;

The International figurative trademark registration no. 1262393 for TANGLE TEEZER, registered on 4 November 2014, for goods and services of classes 3, 8, 11, 21, 26, 35 and 44; in particular in class 21 for ‘‘brushes’’ and ‘‘combs’’, with designation for the US;

The International figurative trademark registration no. 1819217 for TANGLE TEEZER, registered on 16 April 2024, for goods and services of classes 3, 8, 11, 16, 21, 26, 35 and 44; in particular in class 21 for ‘‘brushes’’ and ‘‘combs’, with designation for the US.

The above trademarks are referred to collectively and individually as the "Trademark(s)”.

Furthermore the Complainant is the owner of the domain <tangleteezer.com> registered since 2005.

The disputed domain name <tangleteazer.com> was registered on 11 April 2025.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Complainant, TANGLE TEEZER LIMITED, is the owner of the renowned global brand “Tangle Teezer” specializing in hairbrushes that are designed to detangle hair with minimal damage. Founded in 2007 by Shaun Pulfrey, the company gained recognition for its innovative design featuring flexible, patented two-tiered teeth technology that glides smoothly through hair, reducing breakage and pain. The brand has since expanded its range of products to cater to various hair types, including brushes and combs designed specifically for curly or fine hair, as well as other hair care tools and accessories. Tangle Teezer's products are known for their ergonomic, lightweight design and effectiveness in detangling both wet and dry hair.

The Complainant enjoys a big international reach, with its products being sold in over 75 countries worldwide. Economically, the brand has experienced significant growth since its founding, with annual net sales of more than € 70 million. In December 2024, the consumer goods firm ‘‘Bic’’ acquired Tangle Teezer for € 200 million. Tangle Teezer's success has been driven by its commitment to innovation and understanding of consumer needs, solidifying its position as a leader in the global haircare market.

PARTIES CONTENTIONS

The Complainant contends that the requirements of the Policy have been met and that the disputed domain name should be transferred to it.

The Complainant notes that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name, consisting of a misspelling, which is confusingly similar to the registered Trademark “Tangle Teezer”. The disputed domain name consists of the Complainant Trademark with the only difference between the disputed domain name <tangleteazer.com> and the distinctive “Tangle Teezer” Trademark being the letter “a” instead of the letter “e” in the word “Teezer”. This misspelling therefore constitutes a typical example of typo squatting and the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant Trademark.

The Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests to use the Complainant’s Trademark(s) in a confusingly similar manner within the disputed domain name. The Complainant has no relationship whatsoever with the Respondent and has never licensed or otherwise authorized the Respondent to use the “Tangle Teezer” Trademark in the disputed domain name.

Finally, the Complainant states that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name, which is a textbook example of “typosquatting” and that it is inconceivable that the registration was made without prior knowledge of the Complainant's Trademark, therefore it cannot constitute a good faith registration or fair use. In the present case, the Respondent’s website (which is no longer accessible) was offering the Complainant’s products (hairbrushes and hair combs) for sale. Furthermore, when the website associated with the disputed domain name was still active, the Respondent was using the Complainant’s Trademarks in a prominent manner on its website, including the figurative Trademarks in the header. The Respondent website was targeting US customers as the prices were indicated in USD. These facts clearly demonstrate that the Respondent intended to use the disputed domain name for commercial gain to mislead or divert customers.

Based on the foregoing, the disputed domain name must be considered to be registered and used in bad faith.

No administratively compliant Response has been filed.

RIGHTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the Complainant has rights (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(i) of the Policy).

This is a typical case of typo squatting, merely replacing the latter of two "ee"'s with an "a" spelling "tangleteazer" instead of "tangleteezer", it is found that the disputed domain name <tangleteazer.com> is confusingly similar to the Complainant´s well-known trademark TANGLE TEEZER.

NO RIGHTS OR LEGITIMATE INTERESTS

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the Respondent to have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy).

BAD FAITH

The Complainant has, to the satisfaction of the Panel, shown the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in

bad faith (within the meaning of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy).

Given the circumstances of the case, among others the well-known character of Complainant's trademark TANGLE TEEZER, it is inconceivable to the Panel in the current circumstances that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name without prior knowledge of the Complainant and the Complainant's marks and other domain names.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

The incorporation of a well-known mark into a domain name, coupled with an inactive website, may in itself be evidence of bad faith registration and use. In addition to this, the previous use of the disputed domain name was clearly used in bad faith.

It is not possible for the Panel to conceive of any plausible contemplated active use of the disputed domain name by the Respondent that would not be illegitimate, such as by being a passing off, an infringement of consumer protection legislation, or an infringement of the Complainant's rights under trademark law.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

PROCEDURAL FACTORS

The Panel is satisfied that all procedural requirements under UDRP were met and there is no other reason why it would be inappropriate to provide a decision.

PRINCIPAL REASONS FOR THE DECISION

The three essential issues under the paragraph 4(a) of the Policy are whether:

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

ii. the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the domain name; and

iii. the domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

2. The Panel reviewed carefully all documents provided by the Complainant. The Respondent did not provide the Panel with any documents or statements. The Panel also visited all available websites and public information concerning the disputed domain name, namely the WHOIS databases.

3. The UDRP Rules clearly say in Article 3 that any person or entity may initiate an administrative proceeding by submitting a complaint in accordance with the Policy and these Rules.

4. The Panel therefore came to the following conclusions:

a) The Complainant states and proves that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to its trademark and its domain names. Indeed, the disputed domain name is merely a minor hardly noticeable miss-spelling of the Complainant's trademark.

The disputed domain name is therefore deemed confusingly similar.

b) The Respondent is not generally known by the disputed domain name and has not acquired any trademark or service mark rights in the name or mark, nor is there any authorization for the Respondent by the Complainant to use or register the disputed domain name. The Panel therefore finds that the Respondent does not have rights or legitimate interest with respect to the disputed domain name.

c) It is clear that the Complainant's trademarks and website(s) were used by the Complainant long time before the disputed domain name was registered.

The Panel finds it inconceivable that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant's well-known trademarks and other domain names at the time of registering the disputed domain name and therefore finds that the disputed domain name was registered in bad faith.

The incorporation of a well-known mark into a domain name, coupled with an inactive website, may in itself be evidence of bad faith registration and use.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

For the reasons stated above, it is the decision of this Panel that the Complainant has satisfied all three elements of paragraph 4(a) of the Policy.

FOR ALL THE REASONS STATED ABOVE, THE COMPLAINT IS

Accepted

AND THE DISPUTED DOMAIN NAME(S) IS (ARE) TO BE

1. **tangleteazer.com**: Transferred

PANELLISTS

Name	**Lars Karnoe**

DATE OF PANEL DECISION 2025-08-25

Publish the Decision