

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

The Knowledge Academy Holdings Limited v. Host Master, Transure Enterprise Ltd
Case No. D2025-2733

1. The Parties

The Complainant is The Knowledge Academy Holdings Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Michelmores LLP, United Kingdom.

The Respondent is Host Master, Transure Enterprise Ltd, United States of America.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <theknowledgracademy.com> is registered with Above.com, Inc. (the "Registrar").

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the "Center") on July 10, 2025. On July 10, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 15, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Unknown Persons) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on, 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 July 18, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Policy" or "UDRP"), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Rules"), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the "Supplemental Rules").

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 24, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 13, 2025. On July 16, 2025, the Registrar informed that they have been advised "the client does not contest and happy to transfer domain". The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent's default on August 14, 2025.

The Center appointed Beatrice Onica Jarka as the sole panelist in this matter on August 18, 2025. 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 the holding company of The Knowledge Academy Limited, incorporated on April 1, 2009, which is a business and IT training company which operates globally, providing training solutions to corporate, public sector, multinational organisations and private individuals.

The Complainant delivers training in a wide range of areas from IT technical, personal development, human resources and management courses to project, programme and IT service management.

The Complainant offers its services to the public through various channels, including through its website “www.theknowledgeacademy.com”, through eLearning courses, and face to face through its extensive network of highly experienced instructors.

The Complainant is the holder of various trademark registrations worldwide for the word mark THE KNOWLEDGE ACADEMY in Australia, the European Union, New Zealand, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom and the United States of America, among which (“Complainant’s Mark”):

- European Union registration no. 018157130 from May 22, 2020 for classes 9, 16, 35, and 41; and
- United Kingdom registration no. UK00003104125 from July 17, 2015 for classes 9, 16, 35, and 41.

The Complainant is also the registrant of a portfolio of domain names including <theknowledgeacademy.com> which was registered on March 9, 2009.

The Respondent registered the disputed domain name on May 7, 2025. The disputed domain name resolves to a parking page with pay-per-click (“PPC”) links.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that:

- the disputed domain name is identical or nearly identical to the Complainant’s Marks and to the Complainant’s business and trading name, as the Complainant’s Marks and the disputed domain name differ only with the replacement of the letter “e” with the letter “r” which represents a classical typosquatting
- the Respondent registered the disputed domain name knowing that it is likely to attract interest from Internet users who are searching for the Complainant.
- the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in the full knowledge of the activities and reputation of the Complainant, given the Complainant’s reputation in THE KNOWLEDGE ACADEMY.
- the Respondent must have been aware that in registering the disputed domain name it was misappropriating the valuable intellectual property of the Complainant and freeriding on and taking unfair advantage of the valuable intellectual property of the Complainant.
- the Respondent’s blank page is evidence that the Respondent has registered the disputed domain name in bad faith without a genuine intention of using the disputed domain name for a proper purpose.
- the use of a parking page is typical behaviour known colloquially as “domain squatting” or “cybersquatting”.

- the disputed domain name has been registered in bad faith for illegitimate purposes in order to infringe the Complainant's Marks; to deceive the public into believing that the goods and services offered by the Respondent are connected to the Complainant; and to use the website hosted at the disputed domain name as a means to deceive consumers as described above, including into believing that the Respondent and the Complainant are connected.

B. Respondent

Although procedurally summoned, the Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

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 Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition, ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The entirety of the mark is almost reproduced within the disputed domain name. The Complainant's Marks and the disputed domain name differ only with the replacement of the letter "e" with the letter "r". Despite the replacement of the letter "e" with the letter "r", the Panel finds the mark is recognisable within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), sections 1.7. and 1.9.

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

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving 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 3.0](#), 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.

Considering the Respondent's use of the disputed domain name as a parking page and the notoriety of the Complainant's trademark, the Panel notes that it is likely that the Respondent registered the disputed domain name in the full knowledge of the activities and reputation of the Complainant.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name to host a parked page comprising PPC links does not represent a bona fide offering where such links compete with or capitalize on the reputation and goodwill of the complainant's mark or otherwise mislead Internet users. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.9.

Accordingly, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent's registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1.

In the present case, the Panel notes that given the reputation of the Complainant's Marks the disputed domain name appears to be registered in bad faith for illegitimate purposes in order to infringe the Complainant's Marks and to unfairly capitalize on them.

The Panel finds that by using the disputed domain name, the Respondent intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to its website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant's Mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the disputed domain name, in bad faith pursuant to paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Accordingly, 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 <theknowledgrademy.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Dr. Beatrice Onica Jarka/

Dr. Beatrice Onica Jarka

Sole Panelist

Date: August 29, 2025